

Desch

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

APR 6 1951

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
HAYDEN, DONALD.—Toward an Understanding of Wordsworth's 'The Borderers,'	1
LOFTIS, JOHN.—Richard Steele and the Drury Lane Management,	7
WHITING, GEORGE W.—Christ's Miraculous Fast,	12
HOLADAY, ALLAN.—Thomas Heywood and the Low Countries,	16
FALK, SIGNI.—Plautus' 'Persa' and Middleton's 'A Trick to Catch the Old One,'	19
WILSON, ROBERT H.—Notes on Malory's Sources,	22
SMITH, ROLAND M.—Five Notes on Chaucer and Froissart,	27
HOLMAN, C. H.—"Marerez mysse" in 'The Pearl,'	33
MEZGER, FRITZ.—Two Notes on 'Beowulf,'	36
CASSIDY, VINCENT.—Jack and Jill,	38
CLINE, RUTH HUFF.—A Note on 'Hamlet,'	40

REVIEWS:—

RUDOLF GOTTFRIED (ed.), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser; A Variorum Edition: Spenser's Prose Works.</i> [G. R. Potter.]	41
H. N. FAIRCHILD, <i>Religious Trends in English Poetry. Vol. III: 1780-1830: Romantic Faith.</i> [Ernest Bernbaum.]	43
R. H. FOGLE, <i>The Imagery of Keats and Shelley: A Comparative Study.</i> [R. B. Heilman.]	46
H. E. ROLLINS (ed.), <i>The Keats Circle, Letters and Papers, 1816-1878.</i> [G. H. Ford.]	49
J. S. LYON, <i>The Excursion: A Study.</i> [J. F. Logan.]	51
JACK SIMMONS, <i>Robert Southey.</i> [B. R. Davis.]	54
BERNARD BLACKSTONE, <i>English Blake.</i> [Northrop Frye.]	55
GILBERT THOMAS, <i>William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century.</i> [Lodwick Hartley.]	57
JOHN ARTHOS, <i>The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry.</i> [W. K. Wimsatt, Jr.]	59
W. C. BROWN, <i>The Triumph of Form. A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet.</i> [R. W. Rogers.]	61
R. C. BOYS, <i>Sir Richard Blackstone and the Wits.</i> [R. W. Rogers.]	62
SIR ARNOLD MCNAIR, <i>Dr. Johnson and the Law.</i> [E. L. MacAdam, Jr.]	64
BASIL WILLEY, <i>Nineteenth Century Studies.</i> [Emery Neff.]	66
ANDRÉ BOURGOIS, <i>René Boylesve et le problème de l'amour.</i> [Aaron Schaffer.]	68
ROMAN JAKOBSON and E. J. SIMMONS (eds.), <i>Russian Epic Studies.</i> [Richard Burri.]	70

BRIEF MENTION: J. D. WILSON (ed.), *Julius Caesar.* By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE; ERKEI VALLI, *Zur Verfasserfrage der Königberger Apostelgeschichte;* BERNARD MARTIN, *The Ancient Mariner and the Authentic Narrative,*

71

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston,
Pedro Salinas, Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RNS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

MODERN FRENCH LANGUAGE SERIES

by Travis

*State Adopted in
Louisiana, Mississippi,
Tennessee, Utah, Nevada*



Cours Elementaire de Francais \$1.75
Cours Moyen de Francais—Part 1 2.25
Cours Moyen de Francais—Part 2 2.50

This series is widely used, not only in the United States, but throughout Canada and England. Each book contains ample reading material as well as a great variety of exercises for developing conversational French and grammar. Phonograph records with models of the vowel sounds, consonants, and correct pronunciation of the French, including a rendition in French of some of the stories and the poems, are available.

THE ECCLESIA LATIN READER—
Sisters of St. Joseph \$1.90
GREEK VERB BLANK—Vaughn 40
A convenient time-saving device for mastering the difficult Greek verbs.

TRANSLATIONS

We can supply English editions of the best-known classical and modern foreign-language texts of all publishers if they are available.

Write for free catalog MN.

NOBLE & NOBLE, Publishers, Inc.
67 Irving Place New York 3, N. Y.

A 2nd Printing of
Stefán Einarsson's

ICELANDIC

Grammar—Texts—Glossary

6 x 9 539 pages

A grammar, text, and glossary all in one, this volume is designed for immediate and practical use as an up to date guide to the Icelandic language. \$5.50

ORDER TODAY

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Maryland

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

rs
he
pt
es
he
of
o-
ot
P,
ra
ss



Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVI

JANUARY, 1951

Number 1

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF WORDSWORTH'S *THE BORDERERS*

The Borderers has for some time been the center of controversy. Chief of the questions discussed is: where does the play fit into the development of Wordsworth's personality and philosophy? Is it a "Godwinian" play, or quite conversely, is it a refutation of Godwin's principles? Legouis, for example, believes that, like Marmaduke, Wordsworth could find no answer to Oswald's philosophy.¹ MacGillivray, dating the composition of the play as late as October 1796, sees it as a complete reaction to Godwin, written after the healing power of Dorothy, Coleridge, and nature had effected a basic change in Wordsworth's beliefs.² On the other hand, Herford points out that though the preface suggests the play was intended as an exposure of Godwin, nevertheless *The Borderers* is still full of Godwinian motives.³ Indeed, it might well be argued that Marmaduke is tragic just because he is not Godwinian enough.

But the weakness in this sort of criticism is that it forces the play into a preconceived category: an either-or situation. It would be more revealing to chart the symbolic action of the play and note its function for Wordsworth. In so doing, the best clue we have is that left by the poet himself: if the title of the play fits the characters who are borderers, the play fits the period when Wordsworth himself was "on the border." In other words, it is a transitional play; if critics have disagreed on its position, that is

¹ Emile Legouis, *The Early Life of William Wordsworth* (London, 1921), p. 258.

² J. R. MacGillivray, "The date of the Composition of the Borderers," *MLN*, XLIX (1934), 105.

³ C. H. Herford, *Wordsworth* (London, 1950), p. 73.

because the play is a working out of Wordsworth's problems rather than a statement of his solution. Therefore, it very justly contains two positions (Godwinian—not Godwinian); it has two confused attitudes (one accepting society's generalizations, the other rejecting them).

For whatever reasons, it is evident that Wordsworth rebelled against orthodoxy in his early years. His actions, including statements of opinions, afford several illustrations. The affair with Annette Vallon, his enthusiasm for the French Revolution, indecision about entering a profession, and lack of application to studies consistently reject orthodoxy. His writings at the same time are equally unorthodox. He attacked men of wealth like Lord Lonsdale; the letter to Bishop Watson with references to the French clergy suggests his attitude toward the priesthood; in letters to William Mathews he even scorns the British constitution and monarchial government. The first versions of *Descriptive Sketches* and *Guilt and Sorrow* reflect many of the same opinions.

Next Wordsworth moved into a transitional period of confusion, to express which he chose the dramatic form, since he recognized it as best suited for such a purpose. The Fenwick note stresses the relative position of the characters in the drama, which also helped preserve in his mind the transitional nature of the French Revolution. In a prefatory essay Wordsworth explained the psychology behind Oswald and Marmaduke. A young man, he wrote, quits the world after he has committed a crime, and in retirement tries intellectually to prove the good bad and the bad good. He becomes a moral sceptic, though still pursued by feelings of guilt, and commits new crimes as a result. He imagines possible societies where his actions would not be criminal. Motives in the play thus lie in pride, in perverted reason, and in a disturbed mind.

In view of this essay, De Selincourt sees the play as parallel with the French Revolution, whose leaders progressed as Oswald did. The essay suggests how Wordsworth had given much to the Revolution and was stricken deeply at what he came to regard as its failure.⁴ Others see the play stemming from remorse over Annette. To cleanse his mind of guilt, Wordsworth turned to Godwin. The natural ties he tried to escape from, however, were

⁴ Ernest de Selincourt, "The Hitherto Unpublished Preface to Wordsworth's *Borderers*," *Nineteenth Century*, C (1926), 723-741.

stronger than Godwinian rationalism and the resultant clash between philosophy and personal experience led to Wordsworth's mature poetic principles.⁵

We suggest that either of these interpretations is acceptable. Because Annette, Godwin, and the French Revolution are all a part of the same cluster for Wordsworth, the play in symbolically portraying any one of the group may also include the others. Starting from either the political or the sexual interpretation, we conclude that Wordsworth might have become an Oswald; he did not, as we shall see, because he wrote this play. We may thus propose a synthesis: the play does not accept or reject; it is ambivalent, and any comment will be partial which starts from the assumption that the play is an exposition of one viewpoint or the other, regardless of what two views are under question.

There is a good deal of evidence apart from the play that the middle 1790's were transitional for Wordsworth. In De Selincourt's new edition of the poems there is one written to Mary Hutchinson in warm tones of love. That the poem was likely written around 1794 would seem to indicate that a year away from Annette had lessened his ardor. At the same time he began to cool somewhat toward political radicals. In a letter to Mathews he expresses disfavor of Horne Tooke, one of the powerful English reformers who had managed to get himself arrested on a charge of spying in order to vex the conservative government. Wordsworth also began to observe caution about expressing his own political opinions, as Dorothy reassuringly wrote to Richard. Further proof of this lies in the fact that he failed to publish his outspoken letter to the Bishop of Llandaff. The same tendency is also noted in the revision of *Guilt and Sorrow*, to which he now turned; many of the harshest lines he softened and toned down, even omitting some of the most outspoken passages. After the Girondists fell, the Reign of Terror caused him much suffering until he came to hate the Terrorists and took a strong stand against Robespierre; when that French leader died in 1794, Wordsworth says he felt great joy. His emotional response here was acceptable to the staunchest aristocrat.

⁵ Oscar Campbell and Paul Mueschke, "The *Borderers* as a Document in the History of Wordsworth's Aesthetic Development," *MP*, xxiii (1925-1926), 465 ff.

This was the crisis of the disease, which Wordsworth later said he wished he might deal with in some dramatic tale. The most pressing of his problems—the financial—was partly solved in 1795: a bequest from his friend Calvert meant freedom from economic distress. During the course of that year he settled at Racerown with Dorothy, and shortly thereafter we learn that he is writing a tragedy. Later, in *The Prelude*, he speaks of this time as one of conflicting moods of joy and melancholy co-existing, competing for dominance as though there were "two spirits then at strife." This dualism, this ambivalence, would naturally appear in the play he was writing. One of the clearest examples of this ambiguity lies in the two ideas of property symbolically presented. The characters are chiefly outlaws, foraging against the wealth and property of the rich, and in the fight against privilege even theft is dramatically acceptable. To more orthodox minds in the play (such as Baron Herbert), however, the leader of the band is a traitor and a wild freebooter. To maintain dramatic unity, Wordsworth should ally those who help the innocent to the case of Herbert and his daughter Idonea, since Herbert's property has been wrongfully usurped. Because of the nature of Oswald, however, Marmaduke is made to oppose Herbert and is ultimately responsible for Herbert's destruction. In these conflicting attitudes toward property are reflected Wordsworth's own transitional ideas: Lord Lonsdale might remain the representative of aristocratic tyranny, but at the same time the Calvert bequest involved Wordsworth, however slightly, in the defense of possessions.

Another cue is the use of ambivalent terms: that is, terms which represent neither good nor evil, neither acceptance nor rejection, but both principles at once. In the first act, for example, Marmaduke and Oswald look at wild plants growing in the wood. Oswald says his favorite is the poppy, which, though strong to destroy, is also strong to heal: one object, but in it are contained both good and evil. Idonea's description of Marmaduke is another example: his face is meek and calm at one moment, but the next "flashes a look of terror upon guilt." Two more examples come from the beggar woman's supposed dream. One is the gift of a foxglove to her child, who was pleased until a bee came from the flower, stung the child, and seemed to kill him. The other is a dog, which licked the child's face pleasantly, but then suddenly

snapped fiercely at him. In the second act the voice of Herbert, as Marmaduke leads him across the torrent, blesses his benefactor, but the "benediction . . . changed into a curse." In a soliloquy at the beginning of Act III Oswald toys with the contrary ideas of "passion" and "proof," each rising as its opposite falls until finally thoughts and feelings sink deep and have no substance: the good and the bad merge into one vessel. Other phrases are similar in function: "shiver in sunshine" or "be merry enough to weep," to cite but two examples. Oswald's speech to Marmaduke in the third act states this theory of ambivalence explicitly and suggests its reason for existing. If man's good angel fails, he must turn to substitutes and

So meet extremes in this mysterious world,
And opposites thus melt into each other.

Indeed, we may recall that this melting of opposites into each other was the very purpose of the play, since sin and crime, said Wordsworth, are likely to begin from their very opposite qualities. It is also thus, in order to resolve Wordsworth's conflict and the conflict of the play as well, that action and suffering are opposed but at the same time fused; that is, suffering is contained in an act, and though one is temporary while the other is permanent, one comes out of the other.

Marmaduke suggests also the ambivalence in his own character in the second act: there is "something which looks like a transition in my soul." At the end of the first act, he had said that "the firm foundation of my life is going from under me." Since Wordsworth in *The Prelude* refers to himself in much these same terms, he must have partially identified himself with Marmaduke. A later footnote on the play backs up this idea: the day before Wordsworth left London after the rejection of his play by Covent Garden, there appeared in *The Morning Post* a poem titled "The Convict," signed with the pseudonym "Mortimer." The poem was written by Wordsworth; the name Mortimer was the original for Marmaduke.⁶

Finally, *The Borderers* suggests possible modes of action before a person in Wordsworth's situation. The play deals with sin and

⁶ *Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed., Ernest de Selincourt (Oxford, 1940), I, 343.

crime that start from their opposites and may succeed in hardening the heart or perverting the understanding. This was also one of the basic themes of *Guilt and Sorrow*, especially with respect to the sailor's crime, also apparently motiveless like the crimes in this play. In such situations, one may become an Oswald, seeking relief from emotions of remorse through tempting an innocent youth to become a brother criminal; one might also become a hermit, as Marmaduke suggests in the final act, or even like the Romans fall upon his sword in suicide. (It might here be remembered that Wordsworth wrote "An Argument for Suicide" about this time.) Madness too affords a bizarre kind of relief to some, as Marmaduke again suggests (and in the recent De Selincourt edition there is a poem on "Incipient Madness"). This solution is closely linked with that of Marmaduke: he becomes a wanderer at the end of the play, compelled to live in pain "yet loathing life." No ear will hear him speak and no human dwelling give him shelter. This conclusion is remarkably close to that of Vaudracour, usually considered to reflect the situation of Wordsworth. Vaudracour, like Marmaduke, ends by shunning man and even the "light of common day" until he becomes an imbecile mind.

There is also one other solution to the crime-remorse problem: one might turn vicariously to art—the path Wordsworth took—and write out the conflict. Both here and in *Guilt and Sorrow* he was sublimating his conflicts into art forms, resolving in poetry what he could solve in no other kind of action. Apparently he himself recognized the importance of the process whereby personal conflicts are resolved through creative art. In *The Prelude* he records how he wished to create imaginary characters and to them "deal forth the many feelings that oppressed my heart." The most difficult period for such sublimation he saw as that of ambivalence—that time when "the poet, like the lover . . . is neither sick nor well—though no distress be near him but his own unmanageable thoughts." The play thus becomes the means of working out his problems during his years "on the border."

DONALD HAYDEN

University of Tulsa

RICHARD STEELE AND THE DRURY LANE MANAGEMENT

On November 27, 1715, John Dalrymple, second Earl of Stair, wrote from Paris, where he was then Minister Plenipotentiary, to Sir Richard Steele in London. His letter was a reply to a request which Steele had made earlier, but one about which nothing is known except what may be inferred from Stair's letter:

I received yr commands some time ago concerning Mr Baxter and his companion, they took some days to consider wt answer they should make, it is yt they are engaged to a woman here for y^e fair of St Germain wh^t begins y^e 2nd of February. Baxter has 5000 livres from her, so y^e time being so short they are unwilling to make y^e journey into England; when the fair is over you may command y^m but I suppose yt wont answer to yr view wh^t was to have em for y^e winter.

I'm sorry my negociation has no better success, but I hope yt wont rebut you from employing mee whenever you think I can be usefull to you. . .¹

Apparently Steel had requested that Stair engage two actors, then in France, for an appearance in England, and the nobleman had unsuccessfully made the attempt. That Steel should have employed a man of Stair's rank for such a task suggests the prominence which Steele enjoyed in the period immediately after the accession of George I.

Hitherto, it has not been known in which of two theatrical enterprises—the Censorium or Drury Lane Theatre—with which Steele was associated in November, 1715, he wished to employ "Mr Baxter and his companion."² Since at least as early as 1713, Steele had devoted a large amount of attention and money to the Censorium, a private theatre,³ and during the winter of 1715-1716 his interest

¹ *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, edited by Rae Blanchard, Oxford, 1941, p. 109.

² G. A. Aitken remarks: "The following letter from Lord Stair . . . relates, presumably, to some performers whom Steele desired to secure for his Censorium." *The Life of Richard Steele*, London, 1889, II, 79-80. Professor Blanchard writes about the letter: "Steele wished to engage these players (?) either for his Censorium or for the Drury Lane Theatre." Steele, *Correspondence*, p. 109n.

³ George Berkeley wrote two letters describing the Censorium in March,

in it was evidently intensified. There are repeated laudatory references to it in *The Town Talk*, the periodical he was then conducting.⁴ But at the same time he was governor of the Royal Company of Comedians acting in Drury Lane. His name was included in the Drury Lane license, along with those of the actor-managers, in October, 1714; and in January, 1715, he was granted additional authority in the form of a theatrical patent. He was thus, at the time of Stair's letter, the nominal head of that theatre, as well as the sponsor of the Censorium.

It is possible to identify Baxter and his companion and to determine positively that they were at Drury Lane during the spring of 1716, immediately after the winter of which Lord Stair writes. Steele preferred to engage them late in the theatrical season rather than not at all.

Baxter was an Englishman, who at least since 1707 had acted on the French stage.⁵ He was particularly well known for the skill with which he played harlequin, appearing in the principal role of such pieces as *Arlequin Invisible Chez le Roi de la Chine* (1713), *Arlequin Mahomet* (1714), *Arlequin-Colombine* (1715), and *Arlequin Devin, ou le Lendemain de Noces* (acted at the fair of St. Germain in 1716). From 1712 until 1716 Baxter belonged to the troupe of Catherine Baron, who was certainly the woman to whom Lord Stair refers as his employer. An actor by the name of Sorin commonly appeared with Baxter and was probably the person referred to as his "companion." A brief contemporary account of *Arlequin Devin*, presented in France soon after Stair's letter, has been preserved which perhaps conveys an approximate idea of the type of entertainment Steele planned for Drury Lane:

. . . il a été représenté sur un théâtre orné de lustres et de decorations différentes, une pièce comique qui a pour titre: *Arlequin devin par hasard, ou le Lendemain de noces*, en trois actes et un prologue, et nous avons remarqué que les acteurs et actrices chantent et que pendant le cours de ladite pièce tous ledits acteurs se parlent et se répondent quelquefois sur le même sujet de la pièce qu'ils représentent par de courts dialogues et colloques en prose, et ce pendant toutes les scènes de ladite pièce et

1713. See *The Correspondence of George Berkeley and Sir John Percival*, edited by Benjamin Rand, Cambridge, 1914, pp. 110-2.

⁴ See *The Town Talk*, Nos. 4, 6, 7, 9. The periodical ran from December 17, 1715, until February 13, 1716.

⁵ E. Campardon, *Les Spectacles de la Foire*, Paris, 1877, pp. 100-4.

particulièrement ledit Baxter, qui fait le rôle d'Arlequin, ledit Sorin dans le prologue où se joue une critique de la Comedie-Italienne et deux autres acteurs qui dans le même prologue font le rôle, savoir, l'un d'un procureur et l'autre d'un abbé. . . .⁶

With a reputation for such performances as this one, Baxter was employed at Drury Lane.

On April 4, 1716, the usual Drury Lane advertisement in *The Daily Courant* announced a performance by Baxter and Sorin as an afterpiece for the play of the evening: "The Country Wife. With an Italian farce called The Whimsical Death of Harlequin. The part of Scaramouch and Harlequin to be performed by Mons^r. Sorin and Mr. Baxter, lately arrived from Paris; who have variety of entertainments of that Kind and make but short stay in England." For over a month Baxter and Sorin appeared at the theatre regularly about twice a week, performing in pantomimes and dances; they repeated *The Whimsical Death of Harlequin* several times, and presented also a pantomime called *La Guinguette or Harlequin Turned Tapster*, a "new Italian scene," and "an entertainment of mimick dancing by Harlequin called Le Caprice."⁷ Never offering a full evening's entertainment, they appeared only in supplementary afterpieces, and, if we may judge by the frequency and prominence of the advertisements of their performances, they were highly popular and aided in attracting large audiences to Drury Lane.

Why Steele and his colleagues engaged Baxter and Sorin is suggested by Steele's own writings. In *The Town Talk* Steele tells of the threat to the prosperity of Drury Lane posed by the reopening in December, 1714, of Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre, "a new house, finely gilded."⁸ Under John Rich, Lincoln's Inn Fields offered, in addition to legitimate drama, a varied series of vaudeville-type entertainments which proved to be popular with the playgoers of London. Attendance at Drury Lane suffered in consequence, and it became necessary for the Drury Lane managers to offer similar performances as counter-attractions. In *The Town Talk* Steele apologized for these entertainments, explaining that they were the result of business necessity; he deplored the taste of audiences who

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 103

⁷ *The Daily Courant*, April 4, 6, 11, 13, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 30; May 2, 7, 10, 1716.

⁸ *The Town Talk*, No. 2.

10 MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, JANUARY, 1951

preferred "non-rational" entertainments to legitimate drama, but he insisted on the need for meeting the competition offered by the rival theatre.⁹ It is evident that the employment of Baxter and Sorin was one of the measures he and his colleagues took to meet this competition.

Baxter and Sorin had appeared together at Drury Lane previously, though before Steele had entered the management. In October, 1703, they presented at least two afterpieces there, identified in the advertisements as "night scenes."¹⁰ As early as 1696 Sorin danced in London, appearing at Lincoln's Inn Fields as a member of the company led by Thomas Betterton.¹¹ After the spring of 1716 we hear no more of Sorin in London, but as late as 1732 a newspaper announced a performance by Baxter not unlike the ones for which Steele engaged him: "We hear Mr. *Baxter, the Harlequin* (who came from France the Beginning of the Winter) is to appear on the Stage, at Drury-Lane Theatre, next Saturday; the Entertainment is to be *Perseus and Andromeda*; or, *Pierot Marry'd*, with Alterations, & a *New Prologue*, after the Italian Manner, call'd *Harlequin Restor'd*."¹² Baxter was in London for that season and may have been for others of which no record is known.

Perhaps the most surprising result of the identification of Baxter is the revelation of Steele in the position of a theatre-manager bargaining for the services of a harlequin. Steele, like many of his contemporaries, repeatedly deplored the popular taste for "non-rational" entertainments, for entertainments such as harlequin pantomimes;¹³ indeed, he insisted that he had been appointed to the governorship of Drury Lane in order that he might rid the stage of such abuses.¹⁴ Throughout his writings the need for the reform of the stage is a recurrent theme. Several years later he attacked specifically the performance of a French harlequin (though it was a performance more openly immoral than any of Baxter's

⁹ *The Town Talk*, Nos. 2, 6.

¹⁰ B.M., Add.MSS.32249.

¹¹ P.R.O., L.C.7/3.

¹² *The Daily Post*, March 1, 1732.

¹³ See Emmett L. Avery, "The Defense and Criticism of Pantomimic Entertainments in the Eighteenth Century," *ELH*, v (1938), 127-45.

¹⁴ *The Town Talk*, Nos. 2, 6.

of which a description is preserved).¹⁵ In engaging this actor, Steele was sacrificing for the moment his dramatic principles to expediency.

The Censorium, to which Steele in November, 1715, was devoting a large amount of attention, was in part a project designed to supplant entertainments of the kind for which Baxter was known in France.¹⁶ It was an enterprise from which Steele probably hoped to make money, but it was undertaken with the avowed purpose of reforming the stage. "An improvement of the public taste in pleasures," Steele wrote in explaining the need for the Censorium, "which is rather corrupted through the insolence of fortune, arising from sensual gratifications, than from want of just conceptions in general in the people of condition, is industriously to be laboured."¹⁷ The form which the performances at the Censorium assumed, the performances from which Steele hoped for such salutary effects, was principally that of poetry recited to music. But while he was pursuing his reform purpose in his private theatre, he was apparently led by business necessity to engage an actor with a reputation for performances which were offensive for two reasons: they were immorally suggestive (as we may assume from the French account of *Harlequin Devin*) and they were merely diverting spectacles without intellectual content.

The biographical importance of the fact that Steele was attempting to hire the two actors for Drury Lane lies in the evidence it provides that he sometimes took an active share in conducting the routine business of the Drury Lane Company. Although he was governor of the theatre for fifteen years and influenced it in direct and important ways, this episode is one of the few for which there is documentary evidence that he participated in the company's internal management. For the moment Steele was lending the assistance of his high social and political position to his colleagues, the actor-managers, in an effort to improve their mutual fortunes.¹⁸

JOHN LOFTIS

University of California, Los Angeles

¹⁵ *The Theatre*, No. 21 (March 12, 1720).

¹⁶ Steele explains the purpose of the Censorium in *The Town Talk*, No. 4.

¹⁷ *The Town Talk*, No. 4.

¹⁸ I wish to thank Messers. F. W. Lindsay, Allen Downer, and Emmett L. Avery for valuable assistance in preparing this note.

CHRIST'S MIRACULOUS FAST

Some modern students of *Paradise Regained* seem to have been disconcerted by (and perhaps to have misunderstood) the character of Christ. According to some of these critics, Christ the Redeemer, the Son of God, is ignored; and Christ appears as mere man. "Christ," Tillyard exclaims, "is no longer in the main the Redeemer of man . . . The Pauline fabric of fall, grace, redemption, and regeneration, seems to have crumbled."¹ Saurat argues that in the later period Milton lost all belief in the doctrine of the Trinity and that Jesus "fades more and more into mere man."² Elizabeth M. Pope believes that Milton is mainly concerned with Christ the man: "the Christ of *Paradise Regained* is treated primarily and almost exclusively as 'the utmost of meer man both wise and good, / Not more,' to use the words in which Satan sums up all he knows of his victim's character at the beginning of the third temptation."³ Milton, she declares, is preoccupied with "this perfect Man," with the "lower aspect of Christ's dual nature."

This interpretation is, it seems to me, not entirely accurate. It is true that Milton emphasizes Christ's humanity. As formerly he had sung of one man's disobedience, so now he would celebrate "one mans firm obedience fully tri'd / Through all temptation." Christ, "th' exalted Man," the "perfect Man," easily resists and rejects all of Satan's solicitations. But even a casual examination shows that Milton by no means overlooked Christ's divine nature. At John's baptism the Holy Spirit descends upon Him whom the Father pronounces His Son. Although Christ appears as man to Satan, the Devil sees also in His Face some "glimpses of his Fathers glory." Besides, Christ is certainly conscious of his divine birth and his divine mission: "to promote all truth, / All righteous things." Once he even aspired

To rescue *Israel* from the *Roman* yoke,

but concluded that it is better

By winning words to conquer willing hearts,
And make persuasion do the work of fear.

¹ *Milton*, p. 305.

² *Milton: Man and Thinker*, pp. 238-239.

³ *Paradise Regained: The Tradition and the Poem*, pp. 21-22.

He knows that the way to His kingdom will be full of obstacles and peril,

Through many a hard assay even to the death.

Led by the Holy Spirit into the wilderness, he is prepared to undergo the tests which will prove Him "the undoubted Son of God." He is on the threshold of the career to which He is divinely called.

Aside from His baptism and His willing entering into the desert, the first actual proof of Christ's divinity is the fast of forty days. Milton's treatment of this fast seems to be consistent with his entire picture of Christ. He does not plainly designate the fast as miraculous. Indeed Christ apparently minimizes the fast, reminding Satan that Moses fasted for forty days in the Mount and that Elijah for forty days "without food / Wandered this barren waste," as He does now. But that the fast was miraculous is indicated by the lines

Nor tasted humane food, nor hunger felt
Till those days ended, . . . (I. 308-309)

The fact that Christ felt no hunger proves, of course, that He was divinely sustained. Milton does not emphasize the fact. Indeed he contrasts Christ's weakness with Satan's strength, Christ's simplicity with Satan's utmost subtlety. But we know, from God's preceding speech, that Christ is endowed with consummate virtue and that He is destined to show himself "worthy of his birth divine." His freedom from the pangs of hunger is, therefore, definite evidence of his divinity.

Protestant opinion, as expressed in *A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition of the Holy Gospell after S. Mathewe* (1570),⁴ declared that Christ's fast was miraculous and that it was not a pattern for human imitation. We are told that Christ abstained from food, not to give an example of temperance, "but because thereby hee might haue the greater auctoriteye, & beinge exempted from the common company of men, might come as an aungell from heauen, and not as a man oute of the earth." During the forty days Christ had no desire for food: "he was not once moued by

⁴ Written in Latin by Augustin Morlorate; translated by Thomas Tymne. The interpretations were "gathered uniuersally out of all the most approued deuines," and expressed, not forged tales and the traditions of men, but sound doctrine, "the most swete voyce of that great shephearde of the shewe Christe Jesus."

honger: For it is most suer, and the Euangelistes do declare the same that hee suffered honger no otherwise then as if hee had not taken upon him oure fleshe.”⁵

The writer, Calvin, goes on to denounce Lent as mere foolishness “synce it was apointed to the immitation of Christe.” He ridicules those who observe Lent:

They fayne them selues to be immitators & followers of Christe, which obserue and keepe the faste of the holy time of Lente: For they so stuffe theyr bellies at dinner, that at nyghte they may easely go to bed with oute supper.

Scornfully he asks, “Are these like unto the sonne of God? Are these immitators of him?” Another argument against Lent is that it is annual, whereas Christ and Moses observed this solemn fast but once in their whole life. In fact, the Papists’ feigned fast is mere blasphemy. It is a “wicked & most detestable deridinge of Christe.” It is a wicked superstition, which darkens and obscures “his singuler miracle.” God showed a wonderful miracle by exempting His Son from the necessity of eating. But the Papists rashly imitate God and seek to be like Him. The Papists would rob Christ of His glory by presuming “to be fellowes and companions with him.”

Occasional fasting is approved, provided that it be pure and holy. But it is not to be compared with Christ’s fasting, which far exceeded the custom and the ability of men. For Christ was indeed “preserued by his deuine power.”

Arguing that Milton did little more than conform to a trend in Protestant theology, Miss Pope declares that his treatment “avoids any suggestion that Christ suffered less than we do . . .” As far as Christ’s fast is concerned, this statement is not true. As the commentary explains, His fast was extraordinary:

Christ fasted . . . not as we fast, (which som while leaue our ordinary and accustomed diet or fare, somewhiles lesse somewhiles more, we take as occasion & custome shall serue) but farre exceedinge the custome and manner of men he fasted, abstayning wonderfullye altogether both from bread and drinke, finallye from all kynde of foode to sustayne humane nature: . . .⁷

⁵ Fol. 50.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 24, cf. p. 10.

⁷ Fol. 50.

Christ was sustained by the Word, which the *Exposition* defines as "the vertue and power of God, by whiche we bee sustayned as well withoute meate as with meate: whether hee place any other thing in stede of meate, as Manna: or nothinge, as he kept and preserued Moyses, Helias, and Christe so manye dayes."⁸ The identical idea is restated in Christ's reply to Satan:

Man lives not by Bread only, but each Word
Proceeding from the mouth of God; who fed
Our Fathers here with Manna; in the Mount
Moses was forty days, nor eat nor drank,
And forty days *Eliah* without food
Wandred this barren waste, the same I now (l. 349-354)

Moreover, the following statement

But truly wee knowe that Christ was so replenished with the vertue of the spirite, that the ingins and dartere of Sathan could not once pearce and enter into him.

characterizes Milton's Christ, who, although "inclosed in our infirmitye" and subject to temptation, is nevertheless always "pure and free from all vice & synne." This accounts for the essentially undramatic nature of the poem. Christ's humanity and weakness are only superficial. He is in reality both the perfect man and the Son of God. Secure in his consummate virtue, he easily vanquishes Satan and his solicitations. And in the end, as Miss Pope points out, the angels acclaim Christ:

True Image of the Father whether thron'd
In the bosom of bliss, and light of light
Conceiving, or remote from Heaven, enshrin'd
In fleshly Tabernacle, and human form,
Wandring the Wilderness, whatever place,
Habit, or state, or motion, still expressing
The Son of God, with Godlike force indu'd (iv. 596-602)

Critics who are impressed with Christ's humanity in *Paradise Regained* seem to have overlooked a practical reason for Milton's treating his hero as a man. It was necessary, as the *Exposition* explains, "that his deuinity for a time should be hidde, that he mighte bee subiecte to temptations." Through a great part of the poem Christ's divinity is partly concealed, especially from Satan,

⁸ Fol. 61.

who even near the end is, or pretends to be, in doubt whether Christ is in reality the Son of God. In fact, Satan undertakes the last temptation to find out what more Christ is than man (iv. 538-540). If from the beginning Christ had appeared in His divine power or character, Satan might not have dared to assail Him. But the reader knows that Christ is divine. This is shown by His baptism, by God's declaration, and by the miraculous fast, not to mention other proof. For all his seeming humanity, Christ in *Paradise Regained* is obviously, as Calvin writes, "oure captaine Christe the sonne of God." The divinity which is revealed at his baptism and in the fast and which is, as it were, eclipsed during the temptations shines forth in splendor at the end when the angels transport Him to a flowery valley and provide for Him celestial food and the angelic choirs acclaim Him the Son of God.

GEORGE W. WHITING

The Rice Institute

THOMAS HEYWOOD AND THE LOW COUNTRIES

Heywood has himself settled the question, long a subject for speculation,¹ of his presence on the Continent. In an obscure pamphlet of 1641 called *The Black Box of Rome Opened* he remarks that "In Venice they [i. e., the Jesuits] painted the Virgin *Mary* like a Lady whom some of them loved. The like they did at *Shertogen-Bosch* in *Brabant* at my being there, by the Lady of *Piroy*, *Melanders* wife, which was secretary vnto *Grave Maurice*, and set her vp with a child in her armes in *St. Johns Church*."²

Professor Arthur M. Clark first suspected Heywood's authorship of the anonymous *Black Box*,³ his cautious ascription silently approved later by Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum.⁴ Fortunately, however,

¹ Cf. Otelia Cromwell, *Thomas Heywood* (New Haven, 1928), pp. 12 ff.

² *The Black Box of Rome Opened* (London, 1641), p. 8.

³ "A Bibliography of Thomas Heywood," *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers*, 1 (Oxford, 1927), 135.

⁴ *Thomas Heywood (A Concise Bibliography)*, (New York, 1939), p. 11. Both Professor Clark and Dr. Tannenbaum apparently overlooked one of the two editions, each dated 1641. What I take to be the second contains most of the original text expanded by material lifted chiefly from an English version of Jean Chassanion's *Excellent Traité de la Marchandise des Prestres* and includes Heywood's statement of his presence abroad.

THOMAS HEYWOOD AND THE LOW COUNTRIES 17

we can now support Professor Clark's suggestion with convincing evidence. Not only does this tract demonstrate attitudes toward King, Church, and the Jesuits in perfect accord with those of Heywood's other "pot-boilers"; it repeats as well the favorite Heywood stories. Obviously the dramatist, struggling in his last months against illness and destitution, cobbled it from the same scraps used in patching together nearly all his last pamphlets. The *Black Box* version of William Parry's plot against Elizabeth (pp. 8 ff.), for example, echoes his repetition of the same material in *The Rat-Trap*, p. 21, *The Life and Death of Queen Elizabeth*, sig. B4^v, *The Exemplary Lives*, sig. Dd4^r, and *The Life of Merlin*, p. 360. The Powder Plot episode, another Heywood favorite, enlivens not only *The Black Box*, p. 12, but appears also in *The Rat-Trap*, pp. 24 ff., *The Life of Merlin*, pp. 366 ff., and *A New Plot Discovered*, p. 2. Heywood relishes, too, his fabulous tale of the Walpole-Squire scheme to poison the pommel of the Queen's saddle. Besides the *Black Box* version (p. 8), others occur in *The Life and Death of Queen Elizabeth*, sig. B6^v, *The Exemplary Lives*, sig. Ee2^v, and *The Life of Merlin*, p. 360. Accounts of the murder of Maurice of Nassau (*Black Box*, p. 9) and of the Parsons-Campion episode (*Black Box*, p. 7) turn up again, the first in *The Rat-Trap*, pp. 12 f., the second in *The Life and Death of Queen Elizabeth*, sig. B4^r. Even the Ravaillac reference (*Black Box*, A2^r) and the amazing description of a Jesuit plot to instigate rebellion in Scotland and invasion of England (*Black Box*, p. 7) both crop out in detail in *The Rat-Trap*, pp. 10 ff. and 14 ff.

Having thus established our poet definitely in the Lowlands, one wonders when and under what circumstances he crossed the North Sea. At first glance, the late date of the pamphlet, 1641, would seem to preclude any possibility that Heywood refers to the journey of 1590 or 1592 with the troupe of Robert Browne, hypothesized by Miss Otelia Cromwell. But to one familiar with the poet's amazing powers of retention, even the exactness of detail in the above reference would not seem surprising in a remark written so long after the event being described. Still, a later date appears more likely.

Through the reference to Maurice and Melander, we can establish limits of time within which falls Heywood's excursion. Fortunately, our poet's fondness for detail helps us to sift, from among several

similarly named Germanic princes, his particular "Grave Maurice"; Heywood's reference to the secretary enables us to identify his prince as Maurice of Orange-Nassau (1567-1625). Melander we discover to be one Hans Eppelman, a native of Nassau (born *ca.* 1560), who rose to the position of *Rath* and secretary to Maurice, and, as "Herr von Pyroyne," became a Lowlands figure of some significance.⁵ His strange pseudonym, by the way, represents a Greek version of the family's Germanic name.

From the birth dates of both Maurice and Heywood, we assume that the dramatist's visit must have occurred after 1588. And since Maurice died in 1625, we may set this year as our extreme terminal date. But Heywood's reference to Melander's wife, who, of course, may have been considerably younger than her husband, serving as model for a Madonna and Child portrait, suggests a date much earlier than 1625. One finds it difficult, therefore, to suppose that the trip to which Heywood refers could have occurred after 1615. Presumably then, sometime between 1590 and 1615 Heywood journeyed to the Lowlands, particularly to Hertogenbosch, where he became familiar enough with the household of Prince Maurice to observe the painting of his secretary's wife as a Madonna.⁶

A final guess at the time and occasion of Heywood's trip is worth a moment. In his elegy upon King James (1625), Heywood, lamenting also the recent death of the third Earl of Southampton, refers to himself "as most in dutie bound" publicly to express his grief "Because his servant once." The usual assumption, of course, is that Southampton patronized a dramatic company of which Heywood became a member. But nowhere have we other evidence to indicate the existence of such a company. Possibly our dramatist, during the difficult times in 1613-1614, found employment as a secretary with the Earl, famous as a patron of poets. He and Heywood were almost exactly the same age, had both attended Cambridge, and both, apparently, had intimate connections with Shakespeare. And, interestingly enough, Southampton in 1614 did journey to the Lowlands to join Maurice of Nassau in

⁵ *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XIII, 21.

⁶ One wonders why the Jesuits should have admired a lady of Protestant Prince Maurice's household. Perhaps their affection grew out of generous treatment which Maurice from time to time accorded them.

the struggles over Cleves. During the summer he lived in such intimacy with Maurice that one of his entourage might readily have been present at the occasion which Heywood describes. The possibility, at least, is an interesting one.

ALLAN HOLADAY

University of Illinois

PLAUTUS' *PERSA* AND MIDDLETON'S *A TRICK TO
CATCH THE OLD ONE*

The similarities between Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1604-6) and *Persa* of Plautus offer the possibility that the Latin drama may have provided suggestions which the English playwright combined with other material and developed into a first-rate comedy. Both are intrigue plays in a light, farcical vein; both present satiric portraits of greed and folly; both, except for minor incidents or a very minor plot, concern a similar subject, a group of rascals from the lower strata of society who swindle unprincipled sharpers of considerable wealth.

While other Plautine comedies involve the financial cheating of a disreputable character,¹ the deception in *Persa* most nearly resembles the course of action in the English comedy. The pattern common to the Latin play and that of Middleton can be shown by indicating the similar development of the two plots:

1. An impoverished lover needs money for himself and for his courtesan.²
2. He contrives a plot by which a stingy but rich elder, trapped by his own greed, will cheat himself and relinquish money or valuable goods.
3. An attractive girl, disguised as a rich new arrival, serves as decoy to hoodwink the wealthy man.
4. The lover in the Roman play and in the English the lover's friend, a man unknown to the miser, publicizes to the latter the girl's financial attractiveness.
5. The miser, deluded by the rumors of her wealth, her modest and aristocratic behavior, and even more by his own greed, involves himself in financial commitments without considering the risk.

¹ A pimp is also cheated in *Curculio*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Rudens*.

² Other impoverished lovers appear in *Asinaria*, *Bacchides*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus* and *Pseudolus*.

6. The tricksters hasten to conclude the hoax and collect the winnings.

7. The discovery of the fraud reveals the dupe considerably impoverished and the butt of public ridicule.

8. The concluding feast³ reveals the tricksters jubilant over their success and the dupe very much discomfited.

As already suggested, the chief characters involved in the swindle play similar roles in each play. The lover-slave in *Persa* like the prodigal in *A Trick to Catch the Old One* is the entrepreneur: both contrive the trick (P: 1:2; M: 1:1),⁴ bribe the third party with food and drink to serve as accomplice (P: 1:3; M: 1:2), and direct the fraud at various stages to see that it is well executed (P: 4:1, 4:4, 4:7; M: 1:1, 3:1, 4:4). Both indulge in abusive name calling (P: 3:3, 5:2; M: 1:1), enjoy their practical joke (P: 5:1; M: 3:1, 3:3, 4:2), and praise the good deception of their female decoys (P: 4:5; M: 3:1). Each of these sharpers takes a worldly view of love, its cost in peace of mind as well as expense (P: 1:1; M: 1:1).

The girls who impersonate the rich woman play the same type of role: the Roman girl fosters her own good name in lieu of marriage hopes (P: 3:1) and the English courtesan remains devoted to the prodigal (M: 1:1) until married (5:2); both girls assume counterfeit roles of well-bred women (P: 4:4; M: 2:1, 3:1), act the pathetic role of the poor little rich girl (P: 4:4; M: 3:1), and succeed in their trick (P: 4:4-6; M: 5:2). Although portrayed as a commoner, each one is part of a different tradition. The girl in Plautus is represented as stolen by pirates for the slave market; Middleton's courtesan recalls the hoax repeatedly described in "The Merry Jests of the Widow Edith" by Walter Smith⁵ in which a poor country woman, disguised as a wealthy widow, acquires property or marriage from gullible men.

The male accomplice, the third trickster, is in both plays bribed to participate in the fraud (P: 3:1; M: 1:1), executes the plan outlined by the lover (P: 4:4; M: 1:1), and drops out of the play,

³ Banquet celebrations also conclude *Asinaria*, *Bacchides*, *Pseudolus*, and *Stichus*.

⁴ The texts referred to are George E. Duckworth, *The Complete Roman Drama* (1942), Vol. I, and A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton* (1885-6), Vol. II.

⁵ W. C. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare Jest-Books* (1894), III, 7-108, and A. W. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* (1926), pp. 156-9.

when, as contact man and escort for the reputedly rich woman, he has served his purpose.

The target for this sculduggery, the pimp in the Latin play and the usuring rascals in the English, exploit their victims (P: 4:3; M: 2:3:1), are greedy and penurious (P: 4:6; M: 1:1, 2:2), try to ignore the law (P: 4:3; M: 3:1), are easily suckled into the trap and do not question the validity of the rumor (P: 4:4; M: 3:1), and after the discovery are the butt of derisive laughter (P: 5:1; M: 5:2).

Three scenes, important in the execution of the hoax, are to be found in both plays, though considerably expanded in Middleton. In the first a fraudulent exposition of the girl's identity and wealth entices the victim to loosen his purse strings; the rumor is in each case substantiated by a fake paper (P: 4:3; M: 2:1). In the second main scene the girl, her wealth and position extolled, enacts her part as a rich heiress before the man to be duped, rarely speaks and then only gives equivocal answers (P: 4:4; M: 2:1, 3:1). Influenced by ideas conveyed by one of the other tricksters, and impressed by special favors, the dupe makes a snap judgment before he considers the risk. This second phase of the plot Middleton expands so that not one but six gullible suitors have been taken in by the rumor. The third phase, the discovery scene, is associated with a banquet celebration, which provides the tricksters an opportunity to ridicule the dupe and celebrate their success.

The device common to *Persa* and *A Trick to Catch the Old One* is to be found in other plays between 1604 and 1610. *Ram Alley* (1607-8) by David Lord Barry uses in one of its three plots the same courtesan-usurer motif but with a somewhat rougher and more realistic characterization. The same device appears in *Northward Hoe* (1605) by Thomas Dekker and John Webster, varied by a comic portrayal of the courtesan and her clumsy disguise. This same intrigue motif is used very briefly in the final scenes in *A Mad World, My Masters* (1604-6?) also by Middleton; it is hastily sketched in *The Woman Hater* (c. 1606) by John Fletcher in satiric scenes about a stupid mercer; it appears briefly in *The Alchemist* (1610) by Ben Jonson when Dol Common as a grand lady befuddles and plunders two commoners, Dapper and Mammon.

SIGNI FALK

Coe College,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

NOTES ON MALORY'S SOURCES

A significant aspect of the critical portions of Vinaver's edition of Malory¹ in his rejection of a number of hypothetical redactions of French romances which have been suggested as Malory's immediate sources. Not only does Vinaver now concur in the view that Malory, in Books xx-xxi as divided by Caxton, used the stanzaic *Morte Arthur* in combination with the *Mort Artu*, so that there is no need for a reconstructed common source of the two English versions.² He also shows how the selection of portions of the *Lancelot* in Book vi, and the rearrangement of the Elaine and Mador stories in Book xviii, require as a source only Malory's characteristic straightening out of a narrative thread.³

Accepting these latter arguments against intermediate versions, one may extend the first and, it seems, eliminate a qualification with which the second is presented.

The beginning of Book vi, pages 253-72 in Vinaver's edition, is derived, he notes, from two "fragments" of the *Lancelot*, represented in *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*,⁴ v, 87-102, 204-14, which have been generally recognized as sources. To connect these, Malory need only have possessed "a minimum of initiative—as much as is required to turn over some forty or fifty leaves of a 'French book,'" so as to get directly to the conclusion of the story of Lionel's abduction by Terquyne; "for the remaining portion . . . no direct source is available. . . . Where he found the third fragment, and why he chose it as a continuation, is less clear."⁵ Analogues are noted in the *Perlesvaus* for pages 278-82, and in the *Lancelot* (v, 160-62) for pages 284-86; otherwise, it is inferred that the adventures reported must have existed in some text of the *Lancelot*, but not one of the "extant versions."⁶

Now in fact, the question of where Malory found his source for

¹ *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, ed. Eugène Vinaver. Oxford, 1947. Three vols., paged consecutively.

² *Works*, pp. 1600-1610.

³ *Works*, pp. 1398-1402, 1572-78.

⁴ Ed. H. O. Sommer. Washington, 1908-16.

⁵ *Works*, pp. 1400-1401.

⁶ *Works*, p. 1404, and Commentary, notes on pp. 273 ff., 278-81, 284-86.

pages 272-87 can be answered in large part by reference to an additional section of the *Lancelot* which, after being pointed out by Miss Weston,⁷ has been largely ignored. This narrative (v, 306-18) begins with virtually the same account as in Malory's pages 272-78 of Lancelot's meetings with Kay, a group of knights at a bridge, and four companions of the Round Table. Then knights involved in these adventures, and finally Lancelot himself, appear at court for the high feast at Whitsuntide, in a slightly more distant parallel to Malory's pages 286-87. Once again, Malory need only have turned through his source manuscript for some fifty leaves to find the material used.

Of the interpolated adventures in Malory's pages 278-86, those of the Chapel Perilous, from the *Perlesvaus*, and of Sir Phelot and the hawk, with no known source or analogue, do suggest redaction of a *Lancelot* manuscript on a small scale. The episode of Pedyvere the wife-murderer, however, has as analogues in the *Lancelot* itself not only the one already cited, which supplies the most important element that he must carry her remains to court, plus its continuation (v, 167-68) in which he arrives and is sent further, but two other incidents. A story in v, 305-6, provides the element of a lady being killed while under Lancelot's protection; another, v, 246, contains the detail of a wife suspected of adultery because of a platonic relationship with a cousin (in the *Lancelot*, her husband's rather than her own). Since one of these three analogues appears immediately before the third source section, and the others are in portions of the *Lancelot* which Malory would have leafed through, it is not too hard to credit him with combining them, along with some details of his own invention.

For his choice of the third "fragment" a rather simple explanation can be seen. Lancelot, having started out from court at the beginning of the story, must be brought back. A way to do this was provided by the account of his triumphal return on Whit-sunday, after an absence much longer and more eventful than in Malory's version. Knowledge that such an outcome was forthcoming, to encourage leafing through the intervening material, would have been provided by passages in the French in which Lancelot sends word of his intention to return, and this message

⁷ Jessie L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac* (London, 1901), pp. 155-57.

is passed along.⁸ The importance which Malory attached to such a conclusion as rounding out his tale can be seen in his insertion of similar messages at the conclusion of the Terquyne and Chapel Perilous stories,⁹ as well as in his adding appearances at court for characters from Lancelot's earlier adventures.¹⁰ And if the Whitsuntide return was to be used for this reason, it carried with it from the source those episodes involving Kay and the other knights arriving at the feast.

A further question of Malory's method is why the first two excerpts stop where they do, since each goes on past the Lionel-Terquyne material, and consists of a series of episodes without logical conclusion.¹¹ An answer exists in the nature of what follows each section in the *Lancelot*. After the first, Lancelot comes to Corbenic and begets Galahad on Pelles' daughter; after the second, he is imprisoned by Morgan le Fay and paints incriminatory pictures of his affair with Guenevere. Not only would this latter account have been an undesirable repetition of his imprisonment by Morgan in the first excerpt; both stories run counter to the general tone of Malory's Book vi, which presents Lancelot as shunning other women through his love for the Queen, yet apparently being devoted to her only platonically.

According to Vinaver's account of the source of Book xviii, Malory's version can be explained as his creative reworking of a *Mort Artu* text which "differed in some minor points from the extant MSS."¹² As for the first portion of the stanzaic *Morte*

⁸ *Vulgat Version*, v, 254-55, 269, 291, 295.

⁹ *Works*, pp. 268 (*Vulgat Version*, v, 207-8), 282 (*Le Haut Livre du Graal: Perlesvaus*, ed. W. A. Nitze and T. A. Jenkins, 1 [Chicago, 1932], 349). The latter message could easily have been inserted by a redactor to match those cited in n. 8, but not the former one unless the redactor were responsible for combining the "fragments."

¹⁰ *Works*, pp. 286-87 (*Vulgat Version*, v, 313-18). Vinaver in his note on the passage, and also pp. 1401-2, assigns to Malory the invention of the entire ending with this motive.

¹¹ Malory's version of the first section does conclude logically with Lancelot leaving in search of Lionel as soon as he has fought on Bademagus's side in a tournament, as he had promised so as to escape from the prison where he was placed immediately after the abduction. But his promise is Malory's invention as a connective device. See *Works*, n. on pp. 258-59.

¹² *Works*, p. 1577.

Arthur, which contains a parallel story, "there is simply no evidence of Malory's dependence upon the poem or even of his acquaintance with it."¹³ This means that Vinaver must explain away a number of agreements of Malory and the poem against the French, in points of fact though not of phraseology, which will be referred to as they are listed in a previous article of my own.¹⁴

Agreements (6) and (8), Lancelot's delayed entry into the first tournament and the location of the second, are not discussed, although the latter is noted as existing.

Of the remaining eight, three are dismissed as not being genuine agreements. It must be conceded that the statements of (2) and (5) claimed too much; nevertheless there remain the similarities that Bors appears publicly as the Queen's champion, rather than just being ready to come forward if necessary, and that the Queen blames Lancelot for staying behind with her and arousing suspicion. But as regards (7), no argument except the absence of verbal parallels is offered against the validity of the resemblance in the statements that the unknown victor cannot be Lancelot because he has never before worn a lady's favor—a fact which, it may be added, is also stated by Lancelot, when he first takes Elaine's sleeve, in Malory and the poem but not the *Mort Artu*.¹⁵

Parallels (3) and (9), the Queen's nearly falling and her almost going mad, in two emotional scenes, are described by Vinaver as

¹³ *Works*, p. 1572.

¹⁴ "Malory, the Stanzaic *Morte Arthur*, and the *Mort Artu*," *MP*, xxxvii (1939), 127-29. The agreements occur, in order as listed, *Works*, pp. 1053, 1055-56, 1058-59, 1065 (plus other references to Galahalt, 1069-70, 1073, 1076), 1065-66, 1069-70, 1071, 1085 1080, 1092. References are given in this article to the related passages in *Le Morte Arthur*, ed. J. D. Bruce (London, 1903. EETS, e. s. 88), and in Sommer's *Vulgat Version*. Corresponding references in the edition of *La Mort le Roi Artu* by Jean Frappier (Paris, 1936), are to pp. 82, 82-83, 85, 5 (and 12 ff.), 6-7, 12-13, 13-15, 18-19 (also 35), 26-27, 44-55. Vinaver treats the claims of agreement together in *Works*, p. 1572, n. 3, and separately in his notes on the pages where they occur.

¹⁵ *Works*, p. 1068; *Le Morte Arthur*, lines 215-16; *Mort Artu*, ed. Frappier, p. 10. Here, as in the remark at the tournament, Malory suppresses the qualification in the poem that Lancelot has never worn any favor except the Queen's. In the case of three later statements about his wearing the sleeve, *Works*, pp. 1079-81, there are possible suggestions in the *Mort Artu*, pp. 22, 25, for the first two; none on p. 30 for the third; none at all in the *Morte Arthur*, ll. 576 ff., 624 ff.

coincidental agreements in adapting the same original. Yet though this is a possible explanation which might likewise be applied to almost any one of the other correspondences—particularly to (4), since in Malory Galahalt is not as prominent as in the poem, but is just named among several kings from earlier stories—it would be hard to credit the appearance of many purely accidental agreements in so short a narrative.

There are left three correspondences which do seem to Vinaver genuinely significant: this appearance of Galahalt; also (1), that Bors is criticized for agreeing to fight for the Queen—compare point (2) above—and (10), that Lancelot is welcomed at court by Arthur and Gawain. These details are explained as representing minor variants in Malory's source which also appear, through some textual interrelation, in the poem.

Now this is the very method of explaining agreements by a hypothetical common source which was rejected for those in Books XX-XXI. It is subject to the specific objections that an intermediate redactor would have had to disregard Galahalt's death earlier in the complete Vulgate Cycle, and to suppress the story of Arthur's absence at Morgan's castle, observing Lancelot's paintings, at the moment of the latter's return to court with Gawain as one of his companions. More generally, the hypothesis asks a reader to believe that Malory by mere chance used a manuscript of the *Mort Artu* that was textually related to the source of a poem which shows other resemblances to his story in this part of the narrative, and which he undoubtedly consulted later on.

It would appear more reasonable to eliminate the reconstructed manuscripts, to believe that all the agreements reflect Malory's looking at the beginning of the poem as well as the end, and to explain the absence of verbal parallels on the ground that a work could be a source for even a medieval writer when he derived material from it by memory, as well as when he set it down before him to copy.

ROBERT H. WILSON

The University of Texas

FIVE NOTES ON CHAUCER AND FROISSART

1. DANE AND DIANE, *KnT* 2062-64

Editors of Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* have commented upon "the Knight's insistence on being correctly understood" when he was describing—without benefit of Boccaccio—the temple of "Dyane the chaste":

Ther saugh I Dane, yturned til a tree,—
I mene nat the goddesse Diane,
But Penneus doghter, which that highte Dane.

With the form "Dane" Robinson¹ compares "Lat. 'Dana' for 'Daphne' which occurs in a poem published in the Neues Archiv., xv, 401, l. 9." Manly² had reasonably suggested, "The form *Dane* Chaucer probably derived from some French source." The likeliest French source is Froissart's "complainte de l'amant," retold at length from Ovid,³ in *L'Espinette Amoureuse*,⁴ where a similar "insistence on being correctly understood" is apparent:

Dane ce fu une pucelle	(1572)
(De Diane estoit damoiselle),	
Que Phebus enama . . .	(1574)
Et tant ala qu'elle a fuī	(1717)
Sus les ombres de Penel . . .	(1718)
Or est Dane en lorier muée . . .	(1732)
Quant elle fut muée en bos.	(1768)

2. ACTÆON, *KnT* 2065-68

For the four lines on Actæon,

Ther saugh I Attheon an hert ymaked,
For vengeance that he saugh Diane al naked;

¹ *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, p. 780. The twelfth-century Latin poem cited by Robinson could hardly have been a source for Chaucer. Cf. *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 726, note p. 937. As Robinson has observed in another connection (p. 954), Shannon (*Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, p. 304) "dismisses the subject a little too summarily."

² *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928), p. 554.

³ Lines 1637: "Si com Ovides le deserist;" 1762 f.: "Si com Ovides l'paraisonne / En ses escris."

⁴ *Oeuvres de Froissart: Poésies*, ed. Scheler, I (Brussels, 1870), pp. 132-39, lines 1556-1794. See also lines 2855-62.

I saugh how that his houndes have hym caught
And freeten hym, for that they knewe hym naught

Shannon (p. 304) states that "Chaucer gives the details which he could have got only [sic] from *Metamorphoses* iii. 155-252." Robinson notes the striking verbal resemblance between the first two lines and the *x* MSS⁵ of the *Roman de Thèbes*, lines 9127-30: "Acteon . . .

Qui après fu en cerf muez
Por la deesse qu'ot veile
En la fontainne toute nue."

But for the remaining two lines the *Thèbes* offered no help. Actæon's story, like Daphne's, appears in Froissart's *L'Espinette*,⁶ but it is elsewhere that Froissart gives the details upon which Chaucer may have drawn for lines 2067-68. In the *Buisson de Jeunesse*⁷ we are told:

Venus s'en est, ne s'en prent garde,	(2256)
Sus Dyane, qui le regarde,	
Car pas ne li estoit lontainne,	
Ains se bagnoit à la fontainne	
Avec les nymphes qu'elle avoit . . .	(2260)
Là fu mués en otel fourme	(2278)
Que le cerf dont je vous enfourme.	
Les levriers, qui de près le sievent,	(2280)
Au cours moult tost le reconsievent.	
Ne scèvent qui c'est ne qui non,	
Ne nommer ne scèvent son nom,	
Ne plus ne le tiennent a mestre.	(2284)
Là le fault en grant dangier estre	
Et escheir et demorer:	
Riens n'i laissent à devorer.	
Ensi vint Action à fin.	(2288)

3. CANDACE, PF 288

The Indian queen, who is named also in the "Balade whiche

⁵ Chaucer, p. 780. On Chaucer's familiarity with this tradition, see my note on Thiodamas, *MLN*, LXV (1950), 527, especially footnotes 39-41.

⁶ Lines 1317, 2799 ff. (ed. Scheler, I, 125, 170). It is difficult to believe, as M. W. Stearns suggests (*MLN*, LVII [1942], 30), that Chaucer was unfamiliar with, or uninfluenced by, Froissart's charming *L'Espinette*.

⁷ Lines 2232-88 (ed. Scheler, II, 66-67). For "Dane" and "Acteon" see also *Ballade XXXII* (II, 383).

Chaucer made agaynst women unconstaunt,"⁸ appears, as Robinson notes, in the Pseudo-Callisthenes and Julius Valerius.⁹ After calling attention to "the trick by which [Candace] got Alexander into her power," Robinson adds: "But it seems altogether likely that Chaucer here means Canace (*Heroides*, xi)." Against Robinson's opinion, based upon Skeat, it should be observed, however, that in the Introduction to the *Man of Law's Tale*, line 78, Chaucer (unlike Gower, who rimes "Canáce" with "place")¹⁰ rimes "Cánacée" with "writeth he," whereas "Candace" is in both of Chaucer's lines stressed on the second syllable. Thus it would seem that the Indian queen, not Canacee, was intended. Chaucer may have found her in Froissart's *L'Espinette*,¹¹ where her "trick" is recounted almost immediately after the story of Phebus and Daphne:

Et Candasse, qui tant fu sage, De pourtretture Fist ouvrer le droit personage D'Alixandre, corps et visage, Et anama de bon courage Celle painture.	(1798) (1800) (1803)
--	----------------------------

4. THE 'ABSALON' BALADE, LGW F 249-269

For these three rime-royal stanzas numerous parallels have been cited. Robinson compares Froissart's "corresponding song in the *Paradys d'Amours*"¹² which "sings the praises of the daisy." He refers also to a passage in Machaut's *Voir Dit* (6753 ff.) and to six lyrics of Deschamps. But the proper names at the end of Froissart's *balade* are of abstractions who attend the "dieu d'Amours": Plaisance, Courtoisie, and Dousl Regars. Despite agreements "in substance and language," none of the French

⁸ Robinson, p. 636, line 16: "Bet than Dalyda, Creseyde, or Candace." This line, like the rest of the *balade*, seems characteristically Chaucerian, in spite of Brusendorff's opinion to the contrary (p. 441).

⁹ "Ed. Müller, in *Arriani Anabasis*, etc., Paris, 1846, pp. 126 ff.; also the Mid. Eng. *Wars of Alexander*, ll. 5075 ff. (EETS, 1886, pp. 257 ff.)"—Robinson, p. 904.

¹⁰ *Confessio Amantis*, ed. Macaulay, Book III, 167 f. Cf. also lines 147, 201.

¹¹ Lines 1798-1803 (ed. Scheler, I, 139). See also Ballade IX, especially lines 21-22 (Scheler, II, 371).

¹² Lines 1627-53 (Scheler, I, 49-50).

passages cited shows the stanzaic structure of Chaucer's "Absalon balade." Closer than any of them in both substance and form is Froissart's Ballade VI,¹³ which like Chaucer's *balade* consists of three rime-royal stanzas making use of only three rimes and a refrain that expresses the superiority of "ma dame" (cf. the unnamed "my lady" of Chaucer's F-prologue = "Alceste" in G) over the other ladies who are named.¹⁴

Ne quier veoir Medée ne Jason,
Ne trop avant lire ens ou mapemonde,¹⁵
Ne la musique Orpheüs ne le son,
Ne Herculès, qui cercha tout le monde,
Ne Lucresse, qui tant fu bonne et monde,
Ne Penelope aussi, car, par saint Jame,
Je voi assés, puisque je voi ma dame.

Ne quier veoir Vregile ne Caton,
Ne par quel art orent si grant faconde,
Ne Leander, qui tout sans naviron
Nooit en mer, qui rade est et parfonde,
Tout pour l'amour de sa dame la blonde,
Ne nuls rubis, saphir, perle ne jame:
Je voi assés, puisque je voi ma dame.

Ne quier veoir le cheval Pegason,
Qui plus tost court en l'air ne vole aronde,
Ne l'image que fist Pymalion,
Qui n'ot pareil premiere ne seconde,
Ne Oleüs, qui en mer boute l'onde;
S'on voet sçavoir pour quoi? Pour ce, par m'ame:
Je voi assés, puisque je voi ma dame.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 369-70. Cf. Froissart's Ballade XXXVIII (II, 388), beginning "J'ai tout veü quant j'ai veü ma dame." The same refrain ("Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame") appears in a *balade* of three eight-line stanzas attributed to Deschamps (ed. Raynaud, X, lxvi f., no. LX).

¹⁴ Both poems name Lucrece and Penelope. Froissart names Medea, whose legend Chaucer included with that of Hypsipyle. Froissart's "Caton" suggests Chaucer's "Marcia Catoun" (cf. Kittredge, *MP*, VII, 482-83), and Froissart's "Leander" calls to mind Chaucer's "Herro." Chaucer's "Lucresse of Rome toun" seems reminiscent of Deschamps's "rommaine Lucresse" (no. 1274: VII, 14) or "Lucresse la Rommaine" (no. 313: II, 335 ff.). But see Froissart's list (ed. Scheler, II, 303):

Onques Genevre, Yseut, Helainne,
Ne Lucresse qui fu Rommaine.

¹⁵ Cf. Chaucer's *Rosamounde*, line 2, and Robinson's note (p. 974) on line 20.

A recent critic remarks that Chaucer "extended the art of the lyric in the creation of such exquisite works as his own 'Hyd, Absalon, thy gilte tresses clere.'"¹⁶ Chaucer's *balade* is "his own" in much the same sense that *Romeo and Juliet* is Shakespeare's own, or in the sense that Chaucer's borrowings from Machaut's *Jugement dou Roy de Behaigne* "by no means discredit Chaucer's originality" in the *Book of the Duchess*.¹⁷

5. CONQUEROUR OF BRUTES ALBYON, *Purse* 22

No one seems to have located the source of the apostrophe in Chaucer's last poem. Skeat noted a resemblance between the *Complaint to His Purse* and Machaut's complaint addressed to the French king John II but saw Chaucer's "real model" in Deschamps's Ballade CCXLVII.¹⁸ Robinson rightly observes that the parallels are not convincing in either poem, or in the models suggested by Cook¹⁹ among the poems of Deschamps and the Châtelain de Coucy. For the phrase in the Envoy, written in all probability a number of years later than the body of the *Complaint*,²⁰ Chaucer may well have been indebted to Froissart's Ballade XXXI,²¹ whose refrain explains the prosperity of "Brutes

¹⁶ H. S. Bennett, *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1947), p. 10.

¹⁷ Kittredge, *MP*, vii (1910), 470-71.

¹⁸ Ed. Raynaud, II, 81.

¹⁹ *Trans. Conn. Acad.* xxiii (1919), 33-38. Cook's attempt to trace the phrase "Brutes Albyon" to Deschamps (p. 38) is equally unconvincing, the closest parallel being in Deschamps's poem on the various names of England (ed. Raynaud, vi, 87). In the other poems cited by Cook, Deschamps is as hostile toward England as Froissart is laudatory.

²⁰ Skeat's assumption that the poem itself was written earlier stems in part from line 17, in part from the fact that Deschamps's *ballade* was written as early as 1381. But if, as is possible, Chaucer became familiar with Froissart's *ballade* after Froissart had presented his poems to Richard II in 1395, the poem itself may have been written between that date and September or October of 1399, the date of the Envoy.

²¹ Ed. Scheler, II, 382-83. For Brutus' prayer to Diana, Froissart appears to have drawn upon Wace's *Brut*, lines 633 ff. (ed. Arnold, SATF, I, 38-41). With Froissart's "region" (line 12) cf. Wace, line 665; with "Albion" (lines 4, 18) cf. Wace, line 687: "Albion ad non, cele avras"; with Froissart's "Et Bructus fist ce que Dyane dist" (line 28) cf. Wace, lines 691 ff.:

Quant la vision fu finee
E Brutus l'out bien recordee,
Graces rendi a la deunesse
E so li fist vou et premesse, etc.

Albyon" as the fulfilment of Diana's prophecy to Brutus:

Et s'a Dyane as habitans dou Nort
Moult bien tenu quanqu'elle leur promist.

In stanza 3 Diana bids Brutus set out for Albion, which will remain in the possession of his descendants, and her *promesse* concludes:

Encores plus, li dieu en sont d'acort,
Moult conquerront [my italics] soit à droit, soit à tort.

It is quite possible that Chaucer's apostrophe to Henry IV as "conquerour of Brutes Albyon" was reminiscent of Froissart's lines:

De ce qu'il voit la generation
Au roi *Bructus* ensi fructefyer
Et raemplir les sieges d'*Albion*
De la lignie au fort roi Pharambon.²²

Nor is it impossible that Chaucer, who appears to have known on which side his bread was buttered, is here taking his cue from Froissart to express, with characteristic irony, his secret opinion of the usurper Bolingbroke,²³ who had "conquered *soit à droit, soit à tort*" (probably the latter) the Albion of Brutus.

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

Compare Lawman's *Brut*, 1097 ff. (Madden, I, 52-54). For his reference to the prophecy "Que Merlins à son maistre Blase dist" (line 8) Froissart is not indebted to Wace.

²² With *lignie* compare Chaucer's lines (23-24) on Henry,

Which that by *lyne* and free eleccyon
Been verray kyng . . .

²³ In connection with the title "conquerour" Skeat cites Bell: "In Henry IV's proclamation to the people of England he founds his title on *conquest, hereditary right, and election*; and from this inconsistent and absurd document Chaucer no doubt took his cue."

"MARERE³ MYSSE" IN THE PEARL

Most editors of *The Pearl* have felt the need for emendation in lines 381-384, which in the unique manuscript of the poem¹ read:

Daȝ cortaysly ȝe carp con,
I am bot mol & marereȝ mysse
Bot crystes mersy & mary & Ion
Dise arn de grunde of alle my blysse.²

In this note an attempt will be made to present reasons for accepting these lines without emendation, on the basis that they echo Biblical material the meaning and suggestive overtones of which are in harmony with the poem.

Line 381 has regularly been read "Though courteously you did speak," and the meaning of the last two lines seems clear enough. Line 382, and particularly the phrase "marereȝ mysse," has, however, proved difficult to most editors. Morris suggested an emendation to "I am bot mol & mareȝ mysse."³ Other emendations have been to "ma[n]eres mysse" (lack manners),⁴ "marres mysse" (lack or misfortune mars or wounds),⁵ and "mariereȝ (or margereȝ)

¹ Cotton Nero A, x.

² Richard Morris (ed.), *Early English Alliterative Poems in West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth Century* (2d. ed., rev., E.E.T.S., O.S., No. 1, London, 1869), p. 12. The manuscript as reproduced in *The Pearl, Cleanliness, Patience and Sir Gawain Reproduced in Facsimile*, ed., Sir I. Gollancz (E.E.T.S., O.S., No. 162, London, 1923), folio 44a, lines 20-23, appears to be free of blemish at this point.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁴ Suggested by Holthausen in *Herrig's Archiv*, xc, 142-148, as cited in Charles G. Osgood (ed.), *The Pearl: A Middle English Poem* (Boston, 1906), p. 70. Sir Israel Gollancz adopted this emendation in the second edition of *Pearl: An English Poem of the XIVth Century: Edited with Modern Renderings* (London, 1921), pp. 35, 138, where he credits it to a reviewer of his first edition in *The Athenaeum*, No. 3328 (August 8, 1891), pp. 184-185, rather than to Holthausen.

⁵ Gollancz made this emendation in the first edition of *Pearl: An English Poem of the XIVth Century* (London, 1891), as cited in a review in *The Athenaeum*, loc. cit. Gollancz translated the line, "I am but dust; grief woundeth me." The reviewer dogmatically asserted that this reading was an error, that the emendation to "manereȝ mysse" was correct.

"mysse" (lack margeries or pearls).⁶ Each of these emendations attempts to make an element of the phrase "marere; mysse" into a finite verb in a construction parallel to "am" in the first half of the line, and each attempts to express the contrast between the "Pearl" and the sinful speaker. However, only the most general connection between lines 381-382 and lines 383-384 exists in these emended readings. Charles G. Osgood rejects the emendations and retains the manuscript reading in his edition of the poem for the Belles-Lettres Series, although he does not find the reading entirely satisfactory. In his note on the phrase, he writes:

'A botcher's blunder?' that is, I am worth no more than a botcher's blunder, good for nothing. But this is a bit forced. Holthausen and a reviewer in *Ath.* 1891, 184 suggest *manere; mysse*, i. e., 'I lack manners', but *N.E.D.* shows that 'manners' was not employed in this sense till much later.⁷

There appears to be little reason for questioning the reading of "marere; mysse" as "botcher's blunder";⁸ therefore, Osgood's hesitation to accept such a reading and the frequent efforts of others to emend the phrase must rest on objections which will be removed if it can be demonstrated that the four lines have unity, make good sense, and have poetic merit as they stand.

Jeremiah, xviii: 1-6, offers a basis for so reading the lines. The poet may well have had in mind the following passage when he

⁶ William Henry Schofield, "Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in The Pearl," *PMLA*, xxiv (1909), 663n.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 70. This argument against Holthausen's emendation is not strong. By the nature of its compilation, the *N.E.D.* gives excellent evidence for the early occurrence of meanings, but the negative evidence of non-appearance is not so conclusive; should Holthausen's reading be universally accepted, it would become such an early example. Cf. *manerly*, meaning "with due courtesy," in *Cleanness*, 91, cited in Gollancz, *Pearl: An English Poem* (London, 1936), p. 138.

⁸ The *N.E.D.* cites *mar* in the sense of mistake or injure with spellings both with and without final -e from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries. The compound *marrer* [mar plus -er], which would be *marer* if made from the verb form with the final -e noted above, is cited as having the sense of "one who mars" as early as 1420 (Lydgate's *Assembly of Gods*). *Miss* in the sense of wrong or mistake is cited with the spelling *mysse* in line 2391 of *Gawain and the Green Knight*. The meaning "marrer's mistake" or "botcher's blunder" for *marere; mysse* is, therefore, in keeping with the *N.E.D.* citations. It seems, therefore, justified as the reading, provided it does no violence to the context in which it occurs.

called himself a “blotcher’s blunder” in contrast to the Pearl’s perfection:

1. Verbum, quod factum est ad Ieremiam a Domino, dicens:
2. Surge, et descende in domum figuli, et ibi audies verba mea.
3. Et descendit in domum figuli, et ecce ipse faciebat opus super rotam.
4. Et dissipatum est vas, quod ipse faciebat e luto manibus suis: conversusque fecit illud vas alterum, sicut placuerat in oculis eius ut faceret.
5. Et factum est verbum Domini ad me, dicens:
6. Numquid sicut figulus iste, non potero vobis facere, domus Israel, ait Dominus? ecce sicut lutum in manu figuli, sic vos in manu mea, domus Israel.⁹
1. The word that came to Jeremias from the Lord, saying:
2. Arise and go down into the potter’s house, and there thou shalt hear my words.
3. And I went down into the potter’s house, and behold he was doing a work on the wheel.
4. And the vessel was broken which he was making of clay with his hands: and turning he made another vessel, as it seemed good in his eyes to make it.
5. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying:
6. Cannot I do with you as this potter, O House of Israel, saith the Lord? behold, as clay is in the hand of the potter, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel.

If *cortaysly* in line 381 is read “with nobleness or with goodness,”¹⁰ the two lines fit together and present a highly poetic suggestive image. “Though with goodness you did speak (being taken to the Celestial City while you were without blemish), I am only clay and a blotcher’s blunder (marred in the hand of the potter).” Such a reading has the added advantage of closely tying in the lines,

Bot crystes mersy & mary & Ion
Dise arn de grunde of alle my blysse.

For in the context of the potter who “turning made another vessel, as it seemed good in his eyes to make it,” the lines take on a rich suggestiveness in keeping with the idea of salvation, which is one aspect of the poem, although scholars debate its relative importance and its intended meaning.

⁹ “Prophetia Ieremiae,” Caput xviii, *Biblia Sacra Latina: Veteris Testamenti* (Lipsiae, 1873), p. 784. The Douay translation reads:

¹⁰ The *N.E.D.* cites an obsolete meaning for *courtesy* as “nobleness, generosity, benevolence, goodness,” and cites a sermon by Wycliffe for such a usage.

It is certainly probable that the poet could have had the passage from *Jeremiah* in mind, for he was rich in religious lore and was familiar with the Bible.¹¹ If, read in this light, the passage makes good and unforced sense without emendation, we are then justified in keeping the manuscript spelling. The emendations make good sense out of the line, but they lower it to the level of conversational prose. The original, read in the light of this Biblical passage, has poetic excellence, the dramatic value of further heightening the difference between the speaker and the "Pearl," and a spiritual suggestiveness of the type in which the Pearl poet was so rich. A paraphrase such as the following then may be acceptable:

"Although with goodness you, unblemished and divine, spoke,
I am only clay and a botcher's mistake; for I was marred in the
potter's hands; yet I have happiness in the hope that through the
mercy of Christ and Mary and John I may be reshaped upon the
divine wheel into something pleasing to His eyes."

C. HUGH HOLMAN

University of North Carolina

TWO NOTES ON BEOWULF

I

"*hafelan hýdan*," *Beowulf* 446

The Beowulf passage *Na þu minne þearft hafelan hydan*, 445 f., has been interpreted in different ways. *hafelan hydan* was translated as 'to bury' ('to bury my head,' 'to hide my head away,' 'mein Haupt bergen'), or as 'to cover my head' ('to hide my head,' 'to cover it with a face-cloth,' or also 'to give a guard of honor,' or 'a lichwake').¹ According to Klauber, "*hafelan hydan* refers either to interment . . . or, more likely to the custom of covering the head of the dead with a cloth,"² whereas Hoops is certain that the latter alternative is the correct interpretation.³

¹¹ Osgood (*op. cit.*, pp. 98-100) lists over ninety Biblical quotations and allusions in the poem.

¹ Hoops, *ESt* 54, 19 ff. (1920).

² *Beowulf*, Third Edition with Supplement, 144.

³ *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, p. 70.

In translating *hafelan hydan* as ‘to bury my head,’ ‘mein Haupt bergen’ the various scholars (Thorpe, Rieger, Gering, Trautmann, Tinker, Child, Sedgefield (1913), Wyatt, Bosworth-Toller) apparently thought of a burial in general; they did not have in mind a particular custom of burying the head, and not the entire corpse. It is, however, just this procedure that was observed as an outcome of certain happenings in the course of the blood vengeance. In the Icelandic Family Saga it is reported that the slayer brings or sends the head of the slain man to his nearest kin or some other person most concerned about the death of the slain man. We may conclude that the relatives, or the loved one, buried the head, although the burial is not mentioned. In one special case we learn that the head of the slain man, an outlaw, is buried, not by the kin, but by the slayer.⁴

The custom of cutting off the head of one’s enemy in the course of the blood-feud was not restricted to the Icelanders of the Saga period; it is also found with ancient Slavic peoples, and with the ancient Indians.⁵ Burial of the head instead of the whole corpse already occurs in the Madeleine period.⁶

The expression *hafelan hydan* seems to belong to the realm of the blood-feud. In a blood-feud it is the whole kindred that is responsible for the deeds of the individual; the kindred gives protection and lends support to the member of the group. Beowulf turns to Hroðgar to tell him that, if he, Beowulf, dies, Hroðgar is not to have his head buried (a duty rightly falling to the kindred of Beowulf). If Grendel carries away the bloody slain body (*wæl*) and eats it, Hroðgar has not to care any longer for the protection of the body (*no ðu mines ne þearft lices feorme leng sorgian*). *lices feorm* does not mean “meines Körpers Unterhalt,” “mein Lebensunterhalt” in this passage.⁷ It is true *feorm* may mean ‘food, provision, sustenance; meal . . .’ and *feormian* ‘to entertain, receive as a guest,’ but *fliemanfeorm* is the sheltering of fugitives, their protection and their feeding. *feormian* not only means ‘dem

⁴ F. Mezger, *ArkNordFil* 61, 208 ff., esp. 212. It is noteworthy that the outlaw is Grettir, the hero of two exploits “which in several respects form the nearest parallel to the fight with Grendel and Grendel’s mother” (Klaeber); see *Grettir Saga*, chapters 82-84 and 64-66.

⁵ Schrader-Nehring, I, 156. Mezger 218.

⁶ R. R. Schmidt, *Der Geist der Vorzeit* (Berlin, 1934), 203 ff.

⁷ Hoops, *Kommentar* 70.

Gutsherrn Gastung leisten,' but also 'zu Schutz annehmen,' *feormian to men* 'als Vasallen annehmen.'⁸ *feorm* or *feormian* may then express a reciprocal relation between the lord and his man. *līces feorm* in Beowulf 451 refers to the protection, the taking care of the corpse, ensuring all the rights and claims a dead man is entitled to.⁹

II

"lēasscēaweras," Beowulf 253

When Beowulf and his men land on the Danish shore, the coast-guard of the Danes asks them who they are and whence they come. He wants to know their lineage, *frumcyn*, "ær ge fyr heonan leassceaweras on land Dena furþur feran," Beowulf 253. The meaning of *leassceaweras* is apparently opposed to *frumcyn*. One may then define the *leassceaweras* as observers whose lineage or home is not known.¹⁰ Such an interpretation is supported by the OIc. law-term *lausamaðr* m. able-bodied laborer, who has no fixed home,¹¹ 'a tramp, a vagabond.'¹¹ OE *leas-* of *leassceaweras* has the same function and meaning as *lausa-* in OIc. *lausamaðr*. The OIc. law-term makes it probable that the OE word *leassceaweras* is ancient, or is at least formed upon an ancient word similar to or identical with *lausamaðr*.

FRITZ MEZGER

Bryn Mawr College

JACK AND JILL

W. W. Lawrence cites the nursery rhyme of Jack and Jill to show the absurdity of some mythological interpretations advanced by *Beowulf* scholars. His argument:

It is surprisingly easy to fit a nature-allegory into any simple story. One may say, for example, that he believes the nursery rhyme about Jack

⁸ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, II, 69.

⁹ H. Schreuer, *Das Recht der Toten*, ZvglRW 33, 333 ff., 34, 1 ff., and Hoops *Reallexikon*, IV, 339 ff.

¹⁰ The OE word *leassceavere* has been accepted to mean "deceitful observer, spy," 'lose' dh. 'boshaft Späher' (plural) in agreement with the meaning of OE *leas* and the OE terms connected with *leas*; Klaeber, *Beowulf*,³ glossary, and Anglia 29, 280; Hoops, *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, p. 50.

¹¹ Cleasby-Vigfusson, p. 375.

and Jill to be really of high antiquity, based upon an ancient day-and-night myth. Jack is the sun-god (*cf* Latin *jaculum*, "javelin," "spear"—the spear-like rays of the sun); he climbs the hill of the heavens, but falls down and breaks his crown (the setting of the sun and the spreading of its rays in all directions at sunset). Jill is a feminine divinity, the moon-goddess, who also climbs the heavens, and "comes tumbling after" the sun, as the moon sets after the sunset is long past. The "pail of water" is the dew, which falls upon the earth at evening, although it might also be interpreted as evening or morning showers.

This is no more absurd than much serious mythologizing has been.¹

In this connection it is very interesting to note the following remarks of S. Baring-Gould:

Now let us turn to Scandinavian mythology, . . .

Mani, the moon, stole two children from their parents, and carried them up to heaven. Their names were Hjuki and Bil. They had been drawing water from the well Byrgir, in the bucket Soegr, suspended from the pole Simul, which they bore upon their shoulders. These children, pole, and bucket were placed in heaven, "where they could be seen from earth." This refers undoubtedly to the spots in the moon; and so the Swedish peasantry explain these spots to this day, as representing a boy and a girl bearing a pail of water between them. Are we not reminded at once of our nursery rhyme—

"Jack and Jill went up a hill
To fetch a pail of water;
Jack fell down, and broke his crown,
And Jill came tumbling after"?

This verse . . . I have no hesitation in saying has a high antiquity, and refers to the Eddaic Hjuki and Bil. The names indicate as much. Hjuki, in Norse, would be pronounced Juki, which would readily become Jack; and Bil, for the sake of euphony, and in order to give a female name to one of the children, would become Jill.

The fall of Jack, and the subsequent fall of Jill, simply represent the vanishing of one moon-spot after another, as the moon wanes.

But the old Norse myth had a deeper signification than merely an explanation of the moon spots.

Hjuki is derived from the verb *jakka*, to heap or pile together, to assemble and increase; and Bil from *bila*, to break up or dissolve. Hjuki and Bil, therefore signify nothing more than the waxing and waning of the moon, and the water they are represented as bearing signifies the fact that the rainfall depends on the phases of the moon.²

VINCENT CASSIDY

University of North Carolina

¹ Lawrence, W. W., *Beowulf and Epic Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), pp. 159-160.

² Baring-Gould, S., *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages* (New York: John B. Alden, 1885), pp. 116-117.

A NOTE ON HAMLET

There is a line in *Hamlet* that I think has an obvious interpretation, which I do not find in any textual notes. The line is spoken by Horatio: "This lapwing runs away with the shell on his head" (v, ii, 193). A typical annotation on this passage is that of Kittredge: "A mere jest at Osric's juvenile self-sufficiency: 'This young fellow is as forward as a lapwing, which begins to run before it is fairly out of the shell.' The lapwing was proverbially precocious."¹

At the beginning of the scene (v, ii 81-193), Hamlet says to Osric, "Put your bonnet to his right use. 'Tis for the head," but Osric refuses to do so saying, "I thank your lordship, it is very hot." Osric wins in the contest in politeness, however, for after some foolish conversation about the weather and after Osric has begun again to deliver his message, Hamlet again tries to persuade Osric to put his hat on, with the result that Osric says "Nay, good my lord; for mine ease, in good faith." After the message of the king has finally been delivered, and Osric has started on his way, Horatio speaks the line quoted above, "This lapwing runs away with the shell on his head." It may be that the "juvenile self-sufficiency" of Osric suggested the lapwing to Horatio, but I can well imagine that the image became complete when Osric on departing put his hat on.

RUTH HUFF CLINE

Eastern Illinois State College

¹ *Hamlet* v, ii, 193-201, *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare*, edited by George L. Kittredge, Boston, 1946.

REVIEWS

The Works of Edmund Spenser; A Variorum Edition: Spenser's Prose Works. Ed. by RUDOLF GOTTFRIED. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949. Pp: xv + 570. \$8.00.

With Rudolf Gottfried's editing of Spenser's prose works, the "Johns Hopkins Spenser" reaches (except for a final glossary and index to the whole, which are still in preparation) completion. It stands a permanent monument to the skill and industry of the many scholars who have edited its various parts or have in innumerable ways helped in the work, and to the wisdom, patience, and perseverance of its general editors, Edwin Greenlaw, Charles Grosvenor Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford, and Ray Heffner. Three of the four general editors, and at least one of the editors of specific volumes, have, alas, found life briefer than even this one work of art. Honor is due to their memory; and equal honor to Professor Osgood, who now stands as the surviving head of the enterprise and has the satisfaction of seeing it in print. May he see many more works of his own and of his younger colleagues brought to successful fruition!

The prose of a man who was, and who recognized himself to be, primarily a poet is by its nature not likely to attract as many readers as his verse. Nevertheless, it is material not to be neglected by a serious student. The Spenser-Harvey letters are illuminating for the many bits and hints of information they contain regarding Spenser's early life, work, and personality; and they are exasperating because of all the things they do *not* say. They settle some questions and raise more. The *View of the Present State of Ireland* deserves study equally by students of *The Faerie Queene* and by those interested in the troubled and tortuous course of Irish history. The fact that it is in many ways an excellent piece of sixteenth-century prose adds, of course, to its interest. The value of these documents has been known for generations. The place in the Spenser canon of *Axiochus* and *A Brief Note of Ireland* is still under dispute, and their significance not yet settled by a long-continued consensus of scholars and critics. Professor Gottfried is to be commended for making definite decisions regarding each work, justifying his decisions by argument and explanation, and then following them consistently in his editorial practice; but he himself doubtless recognizes that final conclusions regarding the place and significance of these documents will probably not be made for some years yet.

In the determination of his text, Professor Gottfried is cautious,

even sometimes to the point of timidity. That to print the "View" in its original state of punctuation and spelling makes it unattractive to the casual reader is, to be sure, irrelevant, since this edition is not meant to be adapted to the tastes of a casual reader; and the Ellesmere manuscript at the Huntington Library is at least as good a source to follow as any other. When, however, there are fourteen other manuscripts extant, of varying degrees of merit, it seems unnecessarily strict for a present-day editor to refuse to use them in determining his main text even where they clearly correct mistakes in the Ellesmere manuscript. For example, one exasperating habit of the Ellesmere copyist is to place the mark of parenthesis before a parenthetical phrase but not after it (pp. 44, 63, 65, etc.). It is true that this habit is not unknown elsewhere in Elizabethan manuscripts and printed texts (as well as in the writings of twentieth-century college students); but since the Ellesmere manuscript is itself not at all consistent in the practice, and especially since practically every such omission is supplied in one or more of the other manuscripts, to follow the one manuscript against others simply because that one was chosen to be the basic text seems unnecessarily unkind to the reader who has to re-study the sentences concerned in order to perceive where the parenthesis is meant to end. Surely an editor may well correct what are clearly scribal blunders in punctuation, and even in wording, especially when other more or less reliable manuscripts support the correction.—Nevertheless, excessive caution is probably better than excessive boldness in such matters; and a careful reader can by consulting the admirably full lists of variants at the bottom of each page find the evidence for deciding for himself what was Spenser's intention and what the carelessness of a copyist. The *View* presents very difficult textual problems; and though Professor Gottfried appears to the present reviewer to have somewhat oversimplified them, at least his procedure is explicit and consistent.

The commentary in this volume is excellent; and especially admirable is that which comes from Professor Gottfried himself. Again and again, after including various divergent opinions on a problem of interpretation, he ends his citations with a brief statement of his own that not only is judicious in itself but is substantiated by new, specific, and often convincing evidence. Frequently his accumulation of detailed evidence puts to shame the vague generalities of previous commentators. He has contributed more new factual data to elucidate these prose works—and especially the *View*—than has any previous scholar.

The hope of all editors of such large works as the Variorum Spenser is that their edition will stand for a good many years, not as the final settlement of all problems relative to the author, but as a useful summation of past scholarship and a solid and necessary basis for further research and interpretation. Already the earliest

volumes of this edition have been in print nearly two decades, and have successfully survived the test of that much time. Their blue and gold covers have become pleasantly familiar to more and more students of our literature. Although various books and articles published since their appearance have added information and altered some of the detailed conclusions in them, they are not superseded; and the latest volumes of the edition seem destined to stand with equal solidity.

GEORGE R. POTTER

University of California

Religious Trends in English Poetry. Volume III: 1780-1830: Romantic Faith. By HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. xii + 549. \$6.75.

If one glanced at the beginning of this book, and then at its conclusion, one might light upon these assertions: "Romanticism, at its deepest and most intense, is essentially a religious experience" (p. 3), and "The religion preached from the pulpits of liberal Christianity and liberal Judaism, and from those of innumerable miscellaneous cults, is often barely distinguishable from the religion of the romantic poets" (p. 502). But if he jumped to the conclusion that this therefore was a work of admiring appreciation of the Romantics, he would be mistaken. Both assertions are true; but the second is meant to express strong disapproval of the romantic faith.

The reviewers of the first two volumes admired, as I do, the diligence and sincere earnestness of the author; but they hinted that his judgments were warped by sectarianism. Since those volumes dealt mainly with religious verse of slight literary value, the judgments were not of crucial importance. In the third volume, however, Professor Fairchild applies his dogmas to the lives and works of poets of the highest rank,—including Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley; and the soundness of his criteria and judgments becomes a serious problem.

Inasmuch as most scholars are unfamiliar with the kind of approach to poetry that Professor Fairchild favors, I illustrate the nature, method, and quality of his criticism by quoting the main points of his comments on Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, as follows:

They give the impression of being the result of a collaboration between a humane Protestant who wishes to say all that can be justly said for Catholicism and a humane Catholic who wishes to be equally polite to Protestantism. The plus and minus signs in this travesty of the *via media* cancel out, leaving an intellectual and spiritual zero. . . . The sonnets are vitiated by the author's inability or unwillingness to grapple with

theological principles. . . . The fundamental problems concerning the nature of the Visible Church and the source of its authority are left untouched: we do not know whether it is the Mystical Body of Christ and the extension of the Incarnation or a man-made association of worshippers. . . . Did the Church *in England*, upon becoming the Church of England, continue in communion with the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church?

Such a typical passage may explain why I am reluctantly forced to regard this work as not a literary, nor even a religious, but in the main a theological study. It would make a valuable addition to a series of doctrinal books for Anglo-Catholics. A better title would be: "The Relation of the Romantic Poets to Anglo-Catholicism"; for its main concern is with such questions as these: Do the poets conform to Anglo-Catholic doctrines about God, Man, and the true Catholic Church; do they promulgate those doctrines in their poetry; do they speak in the orthodox terms and true language of the Church; and, if not, into what heresies do they fall? To reduce, as Professor Fairchild does, religion not merely to Christianity, but to Anglo-Catholicism, a small subdivision of a relatively small sect; and then to apply its theological formulae as criteria to the poetry of the Romantics, obviously simplifies the critic's task, but at the same time renders most of his verdicts, from a literary point of view, irrelevant and valueless.

Professor Fairchild seems to ignore the difference between the theological mind and the poetic, each of which is valuable though they have distinct ends and means. The theologian strives to clarify some type of religious experience by reducing it to the articles, or points, or catechism of a particular church; it is an intellectually and ecclesiastically useful function, but if he succeeds in narrowing his religion to those sentiments which can be expressed in strictly clear and consistent propositions in unambiguous prose, he necessarily must omit much in religious experience that is too aspiring and spiritual to be thus confined. The great romantic poets did not write their masterpieces with the intent of clarifying Anglo-Catholicism, or of attacking it. As poets, they tried to give beautiful expression to their individual religious experiences and beliefs, especially to those deeply moving intuitive apprehensions which could not be communicated in conventional church-terms. Their poems were not, as a rule, in sharp or intentional contradiction to religion as the churches had formulated it. Indeed their interest, to the broad-minded scholar, lies in their supplementing, both substantially and stylistically, the insights into religious truth found in the holy scriptures of mankind.

Professor Fairchild has little sympathy with any of the romantic principles, including the idea that both religion and literature, to keep alive, must grow. The great moments in religious history have been moments of new prophetic insights, fulfilling the earlier ones; and the great works of literature have been created by men

of bold originality, men who gave to what was good in the traditional a new life by partly transforming it. Whenever religion or literature tried to remain static, they petrified into ritualisms, legalisms, and formalisms; whereupon Civilization became like the skeletonship in *The Ancient Mariner*, Religion like its Death-mate, and Literature like its Spectre-woman,-

Her skin was white as leprosy,
The Night-mare Life-in-Death was she
Who thickens man's blood with cold.

The killing frost of formalisms and restrictions lies upon this book, except in the chapter on Wordsworth (he had High-Church associations), which is the best chapter and the least captious. The Pharisees were no more censorious toward Jesus, nor was Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor more hostile to Christ's return to earth, than Professor Fairchild is fault-finding and, in my opinion, unjust, toward Shelley, Keats, and most of the other Romantics.

Since whatever originality and significance this book possesses rests on its theology, I can say little in this brief review about its concept of Romanticism, which seems to me as erroneous as its theology is narrow. Professor Fairchild's thesis is that the Romantics and their poetry were not soundly Christian, and that Romanticism is a heresy which expresses man's unregenerate egotism and unwarranted trust in his own self-salvation, and which is merely projecting his proud egocentricity into the vague inane whenever the poets fancy that they sense the divine in nature. The attacks on Romanticism of Santayana, of the humanists (though these were "not well-grounded," i. e., not Anglo-Catholic), and of the Critical Positivists, are cited with approval. But Professor Fairchild, though addicted to authoritarianism in religion, is a dissenter from the views of nearly all the leading modern authorities on Romanticism. He does not take into judicious consideration the general concepts of Romanticism accepted by such scholars as Bush, Thorpe, Wellek, and Bate; and he does not seriously weigh what has been said about the religion of the Romantics by Charles De Bos, Charles Williams, Hugh Fausset, G. Wilson Knight, J. Middleton Murry, or Newton P. Stallknecht. His most plausible contention, that the Romantics habitually fled from reality (Wordsworth is waved away in a footnote) was refuted in the MLA section-meeting on Romanticism last December, where their realism, their devotion to the particular and the objective, were vindicated as an integral feature of their view of life. Professor Fairchild seems to me mistaken in conceiving romanticism as a movement from eighteenth-century sentimentalism to nineteenth-century aggressive egotism. It began in sentimentalism, but in Wordsworth and others it developed in a realistic direction, psychologically and stylistically, as Bate has shown with respect to Keats.

So devoted a student of Christianity as Professor Fairchild

should, it seems to me, know that many of the ideas and feelings which, when they are uttered by the Romantics, he scorns as pantheistic, self-glorifying, or in some other way heretical, are found in highly revered religious writings, some of them Catholic. If we were to apply his standards of judgment, we should have to disapprove as unchristian and romantic such sentiments as the following:

The works of the creation are, when considered, ways to the Creator . . . Wherever the soul turns itself, if it looks attentively, it finds God in the very same objects through which it forsook Him; and again acknowledges His power, from a consideration of those objects, for the love of which it abandoned Him. (St. Gregory, *On the Book of Job*, xxvi, 18).

He (St. Francis) clearly knew how every created thing expresses its Creator; and how God is above, and within, and without, and beside all created things. (*The Little Flowers of St. Francis*, ch. li).

Jesus saith: the fowls of the air, and all beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, these are they who draw you to the kingdom of Heaven. And the kingdom of Heaven is within you; and *whoever shall know himself shall find it*. Strive therefore to know yourselves . . .

Jesus saith: Wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there am I. (*New Saying of Jesus*, ed., B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, pp. 15 and 38).

ERNEST BERNBAUM

Freedom's Haven, Jaffrey, N. H.

The Imagery of Keats and Shelley: A Comparative Study. By

RICHARD HARTER FOGLE. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. x + 296. \$4.00.

Three-fourths of Professor Fogle's book is devoted to a classification of the images employed by Keats and Shelley and to comments on how the different kinds of images are used by each poet. Having arranged according to their classes all the "effective" images (i. e., those to which the investigator has felt a response) to be found in 1722 lines from Keats and 2318 lines from Shelley (a number of lines "roughly proportionate to the amount of . . . poetic production" of each), Professor Fogle records the incidence of each kind of image in percentages—e. g., visual, Shelley 39.5 percent, Keats 40.1 per cent; "tactual," Shelley 14.8 per cent, Keats 20.1 per cent; motor, Shelley 24.3 per cent, Keats 7.3 per cent, etc. Fortunately he does not spend much time on the slippery business of counting images—a method involving almost proscriptive difficulties—and calculating percentages, comforting as this *modus probandi* must be to the positive scholar; but gets on with the larger business of describing the habits of the two poets within

the various categories of imagery. There is a kind of Teutonic thoroughness here, with the dissertation unabashedly showing through: we have not only the five familiar types of sensory image, but also, synaesthetic, organic, kinesthetic, and motor, and among the last three we must distinguish those which are empathic from those which are not. Despite all the rigors of organization and a rather heavyhanded vocabulary, the discussion brings forth some quite illuminating facts. In the management of the visual Keats is minute, photographic, and in point of view "horizontal" and bounded; Shelley is panoramic, looks up or down rather than around, and seeks to pierce beyond all boundaries. Keats tends to use soft, full, melodious sounds, Shelley to use loud and shrill; Shelley often imparts a sinister tone to the olfactory and gustatory. In Keats there is much more of the empathic than in Shelley, who does not localize sensations in human beings. Most suggestively of all: the abundant synaesthesia of Keats is an imaging of his sense of the oneness of things, Shelley's less ample and less spontaneous brand expresses a yearning toward unity. Such conclusions cannot be reached, nor can they be used by others, without the close textual reading which is essential to serious poetic studies. Although the book has less novelty in its field, it should serve, like Caroline Spurgeon's work on Shakespeare, as a point of reference for other critical studies in the language of the Romantics.

Professor Fogle's summaries suggest much about the intellectual and poetic personalities of Keats and Shelley. The statements about Shelley which come from even so unrestrained an admirer as Professor Fogle constitute an imposing deficiency index. Of his tactile imagery: "Like his visual imagery, it is to some degree generalized, but it is firm and definite." His references to music: "more generalized, less weighty." Of one such image: "fraught with a vagueness typical of the poet in this regard." Of olfactory images: "more generalized, lighter, and as a whole less sensuous." Of organic: "lighter, less closely wedded to the subconscious working of muscles and nerves." Of synaesthetic: "poor in tactal quality, . . . makes little use of organic sensation, and no use whatever of the powerfully physical kinesthetic"; "likely to culminate in abstraction"; "tending toward vagueness. Sense-impressions are often generalized. . . ." Although such statements occupy far less space than others which insistently reassure us that Shelley is very vivid, strong, and solid (there is one reference to his "method of mingling indefiniteness with firm line"), the fact is that these admissions are quite consistent with the impressions made again and again by the passages quoted from Shelley. Despite all the loyal efforts of the impresario, the reader gains an increasingly strong sense that in Shelley there is some incapacity to come to grips with his foreground materials, to work through them, to discipline them into expressive wholes. He is at times "dazzling,"

indeed; and the "insatiable eye" may be most admirably striving for infinity; yet there is some singular unwillingness to look steadily at the object, to realize it, to think poetically by means of it. In this urge to be on, and in the corresponding capacity to become easily intoxicated by a kaleidoscopic flurry of things ("fierce and fiery movement," the author calls it at one place) one may find the source of the failure to maintain tone which, despite certain real poetic gifts, is a characteristically Shelleyan defect.

To paraphrase Smollett's description of Jerry Melford, Professor Fogle is too far gone in Romance to brook criticism of his favorites, and he replies, if not in blank verse, at least in a sonorous vocabulary of adulation — "flawless," "consummate," "masterly," "breathless unison," and so on. It is too bad that an often perceptive study should be burdened by the author's passion for exalting his poets unceasingly, and that virtually every page should have its share of question-begging hyperbole. A trifle can evoke a dithyrambic flight. Keats' "voices of soft proclaim" (*proclaim* is a noun) is not only "singularly felicitous" but "has the soft, full tone and bursting plangency of a plucked harp string; and this effect is mainly attributable to the nervous tension of the locution." What is worse, the urge to rapture constantly transforms the analysis of a poem, in which the author is not without ability, into a merely applauding paraphrase. When Professor Fogle comes to the climax of the *Grecian Urn*—the problematic "Beauty is truth, truth beauty" upon which the poem turns and upon which other critics (unmentioned here) have lavished great care—he only asserts that this is "a satisfying and inevitable conclusion." In a sense this jealousy for his subjects is admirable; at least it is preferable to the professional attitude in which a concern for methodological proprieties is matched only by an indifference as to whether they are lavished upon insignificant material. But now we run too much into this pride of period, which leads a scholar to regard all the materials of his area as excellent, and to view the entry of detached criticism as a kind of presumptuous invasion which it is a matter of honor to repel.

Professor Fogle is particularly intent upon repelling the "new critics," whose laudatory analyses of various Romantic poems he ignores in order to make an all-out fight for Shelley, and to whose sins he devotes a final chapter, in the main goodtempered and not quite up to its task. After his own performance with respect to Shelley, it is extraordinary to find him contending that Tate and others make up their minds in advance about Shelley poems which they judge. It is still more extraordinary that he rejects Leavis's analysis of imagery because "employed in this spirit [it] would demolish any poetry whatever" and Brooks' doctrine of organic unity because it "can be manipulated at will." Any critical method can be used irresponsibly, and if it is, what is called for is not

a rejection of the method but a critical demonstration of the irresponsibility. But Professor Fogle is not even consistent. Nine pages before rejecting Brooks' organic unity he approves I. A. Richards' argument that "the criterion of imagery is meaning, significant relationship." "Significant relationship" is precisely what leads to organic unity, and ironically enough, this is the implicit standard of most of his critical judgments. In fact, it is only by great act of will that he can stick to apologetics and keep himself from being a critic, even a new one. He talks consistently in terms of symbols and symbolism, irony, paradox, complexity, the avoidance of oversimplification, aesthetic distancing; he even defines poetic imagery as "an organization of actuality." Except for one or two unimaginative efforts to rationalize synesthesia by application of a literal-minded associationism—reducing the passages to "fancy," as a well known Romantic critic called it—he consistently avoids what we may as well call the genetic fallacy. And he never once tells us that we have to recover in toto the sensibility of 1817 to approach these poems at all—an encouraging sign in days when some literary historians seeme suicidally bent upon proving that literature is not for all time, but only of an age.

ROBERT B. HEILMAN

University of Washington

The Keats Circle, Letters and Papers 1816-1878. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. Vol. I, pp. cl + 332; vol. II, pp. 519. \$12.50.

The growth of Keats' reputation has been the subject of several recent studies. Professor Rollins has himself written earlier concerning Keats' reputation in America; the present reviewer has discussed the impact of Keats on Victorian authors, and here we have an account of his reputation as it survived among his friends and acquaintances from 1816 to 1878. *The Keats Circle* consists primarily of a collection of letters written by those who knew Keats, and who make comments sometimes about his character or appearance, occasionally about his poems, but more often, of course, about themselves. The letters have been selected from the great collection of Keats manuscripts at Harvard. Biographers and editors have had access to them before and have skimmed off the cream of them into print. But for a poet as interesting as Keats, it is a treat to have the cream and milk together. We have here an assortment of some of the most important primary materials for the study of Keats, most of them transcribed in full for the first time, edited with care, and arranged to make up what the editor calls "a single reference work." These handsomely printed volumes are a welcome

and very important addition to the store of good books dealing with Keats.

The word "circle" in the title is apt. Keats' poetry and personality had an effect like that of a stone dropped in water; the circle thus formed not only enlarges its circumference into new areas but also its original component parts spread far and wide. Keats' friends drifted apart after his death, some of them divided by bitter quarrels. One of the most pugnacious was Keats' brother George, a member of the circle who emerges from these pages more clearly than ever before. A gentler figure, Joseph Severn, also appears in clearer light. The most excellent section of the book, and one that fully justifies the editor's sometimes confusing chronological arrangement of materials, is that in which we follow the sequence of Severn's letters describing the last days of Keats. These "terrible letters," as Patmore called them, are here presented without Amy Lowell's needless intrusions. Another interesting section illuminates the self-centred character of Benjamin Bailey to whom Keats had written in 1818 some of his finest letters. Bailey, who disappeared from the circle for many years, seems finally to have matured. In his correspondence with Milnes late in life, Bailey avoids the trite platitudes and pomposity which contributed to his early break with Keats. G. F. Mathew, on the other hand, never seems to have grown up. The full texts of his Micawber-like letters, which were designed to evoke pity, are really extremely funny. As the editor remarks, Mathew's letters tell more than enough about himself. Some other members of the Keats circle do not emerge so clearly. There is little, for example, about Leigh Hunt, and Haydon is also rather shadowy.

If there is a central thread running through these 350 letters and papers, it is perhaps the story of how Keats' biography finally came to be written. We watch Dilke toying with the idea of writing it, also Taylor, George Keats, Reynolds, Brown, and even the second husband of Georgiana Keats in Louisville who remarks nonchalantly about some manuscripts in his possession: "I have an idea of arranging them for publication some of these days when I have little more leisure." Luckily, the choice fell to Monckton Milnes. Professor Rollins considers it a pity that the biography was not written by Dilke instead of Milnes, because Dilke would have been more factually accurate. Factual accuracy being the editor's forte, his preference can be understood, but we may still be thankful that the task did not fall into Dilke's hands. As Keats himself pointed out, Dilke's "Godwin-methodist" temperament was hardly attuned to his own, and, in addition, Dilke was lacking in the tact which enabled Milnes to obtain biographical materials from all sources (in fact, the very materials making up this collection). Dilke also had a very limited conception of what should be included or excluded in a biography of Keats (see II, 104). Milnes' *Life*,

Letters . . . of Keats does, indeed, contain some errors (errors which scholars such as Professor Rollins have rectified), but these are compensated for by its inclusiveness, its charm and breadth, and by Milnes' knowledge of poetry. These qualities of his biography gained for Keats a host of new readers.

The Keats Circle includes not only letters but also several documents of interest such as Brown's *Life of Keats*, Woodhouse's valuable comments on Keats' poems and letters (from the Morgan Library), a corrected list of books owned by Keats, and the so-called "Abbey Memoir." A lengthy appendix contains material of slighter interest, but even there one occasionally finds a rewarding item. For example, it is startling to find one of Keats' contemporaries writing in 1860 about Dickens' publication *All the Year Round* (II, 477). It is a reminder to us that Keats was born in the same year as Carlyle, and that if he had survived he would have become a Victorian author, just as his sister Fanny became a Victorian matron.

Professor Rollins' painstaking editing inspires confidence. His notes also clarify some points in Keats' biography, including the exact date of the poet's death, and certain phases of his friendship with Haslam. One wonders, however, why the revised edition of Forman's *Letters of Keats* (1947) was not referred to, for we should then have been spared at least two of Professor Rollins' complaints (I, 123 and II, 189) about errors in the 1935 edition. Of less consequence is his reference to Haydon's "Jerusalem" canvas being located in the Cincinnati Art Museum, where, as Hewlett for one has noted, it has not been situated since the time of Amy Lowell.

When John Taylor was writing to a man who did not know Keats, he included in his letter a number of details about the poet and remarked: "These are odd particulars to give . . . but if you knew him, you would also feel that strange personal Interest in all that concerns him." Later readers of Keats, who have been infected with the same strange personal Interest, will thank Professor Rollins for providing us with such an admirable store of odd particulars.

GEORGE H. FORD

University of Cincinnati

The Excursion: A Study. By JUDSON STANLEY LYON. Yale Studies in English, Vol. 114. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. Pp. x + 154. \$3.75.

The poem that was regarded as Wordsworth's *magnum opus* by his contemporaries has long suffered neglect. Dr. Judson S. Lyon disclaims any expectation of reviving the popularity of *The Ex-*

cursion, but in his study he seeks to strengthen a weak area in Wordsworthian scholarship. His book includes a brief discussion of the reputation of *The Excursion*, the history of its composition, an account of its sources and analogues, an analysis of the poem's content, and a commentary on its style. He includes appendices on reviews and editions, and one on the new material in the Oxford edition, published after he had written his book. The study concentrates on matters of essential interest, and much painstaking research has brought about important results with a high degree of accuracy.

The value of Lyon's chapter on the poem's history is somewhat lessened by the fuller information now supplied in the new Oxford edition (edited by de Selincourt and Darbishire), with its elaborate textual notes, utilizing extensively unpublished fragments and early drafts. However, most of Lyon's dates of composition are upheld by the Oxford edition. More light is thrown on the development of "The Ruined Cottage" by Miss Darbishire's study of the extant manuscripts than is available in Lyon's chapter. Of special value is her reproduction *in extenso* of the first complete draft of what has become Bk. I of *The Excursion*, called "MS. B" and "Addendum." This fills in the omissions of Dorothy Wordsworth's transcript in her letter to Mary Hutchinson, March 5, 1798, and enables us to see the emergence of the Pedlar into the story of Margaret and the development of his character as a philosophic interpreter of her tale of woe. Lyon argues that "The Pedlar," often referred to by Dorothy, is a separate poem from "The Ruined Cottage," an "overflow of the character of the Wanderer," the bulk of which was ultimately included in Bk. II of *The Excursion*. All editors of *The Excursion*—Knight, Dowden, de Selincourt, Darbishire—regard "The Pedlar" as another name for "The Ruined Cottage." There is no space in this review to go into Lyon's ingenious arguments. But considering the extensive development of the Pedlar's character in MS. B of "The Ruined Cottage," and the fact that in the manuscripts available to Miss Darbishire there is nothing that might be identified as a separate poem on the Pedlar or to give her even a suspicion that there was such an independent poem, the conventional opinion continues to be almost certainly the correct one.

In tracing sources and analogues, Lyon convinces us that *The Excursion* is more germane to the eighteenth century in its techniques (and in its style, as he later demonstrates) than is *The Prelude*. Its structure includes four popular types of eighteenth-century poetry: the long blank-verse didactic poem, the philosophical dialogue, the short verse narrative of humble life, and the funeral elegy. The sections in this chapter devoted to the models for the characters in *The Excursion* and to the sources of the stories do not tell us much that is not already known.

Lyon's analysis of the content of the poem is an appreciable aid in detecting an intellectual and artistic design in a work that has often been regarded as rambling. The poem, Lyon explains, fuses three major impulses: antimechanism, personal fortitude, and antirationalism. The Solitary, skeptical and pessimistic, is an ill man, and it is the function of the Wanderer to diagnose his disease and to prescribe remedies (Wordsworth never conceived the poem as a debate between the two men). In design, the poem is divided into five major parts. The philosophical and doctrinal core is to be found in the six major points raised by the Solitary and answered by the Wanderer. Lyon has found a place in the scheme of the poem for many apparent irrelevancies.

Many philosophic ideas are pointed out and explained by Lyon. One of the most interesting is the fact that there are very little Tory politics and orthodox Christianity in *The Excursion*. Lyon is an adherent of the "one Wordsworth" school, accepting Miss Mary Burton's conclusions perhaps too uncritically. But although Wordsworth is shown to have little interest in Christian doctrine in *The Excursion*, he has by this date rejected empirical sensationalism. However, Lyon takes care to point out that Wordsworth is unable to deny the validity of the evidence of the senses and to accept Coleridge's extreme intuitionist viewpoint. Lyon does little in the way of relating Wordsworth's doctrines to pure philosophy. He rejects Beatty's extreme emphasis on Hartleianism, but there is much in Beatty's chapter on *The Excursion* that deserves consideration. He makes no mention whatever of Stallknecht's discussion of the "active principle" passage in its relation to Boehme and especially to Shaftesbury, or of Stallknecht's enlightening exposition of Wordsworth's concept of duty.

In the chapter on style Lyon demonstrates that Wordsworth draws heavily from words of Latin derivation; that he shows a return to the poetic diction of the eighteenth century, although he strove for greater accuracy of description and more concrete detail than he had hitherto used; and that he uses imagery more frequently for ornamental rather than for functional reasons. The style, Lyon concludes, approaches what has often been called classical.

Lyon's book is a competent endeavor to give consistent shape to the apparently heterogeneous demands of Wordsworth's longest poem.

JAMES V. LOGAN

The Ohio State University

Robert Southey. By JACK SIMMONS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948. Pp. 256. \$4.00.

"There he stands to the life; independent, irritable, generous, kind-hearted, loyal—above all, intensely human. There is not a nobler portrait in our literature." So Mr. Simmons, referring to Southey's letters; and the passage may well serve as the *envoi* to his own book, the fruit of sound scholarship and wide research, and a labour of love. The love is reasoned. All the exasperating weaknesses in Southey's character, which provided such rich and rememberable sport for Byron's merciless satire, the self-righteousness, the vainglory, the political and moral intolerance, have been fairly weighed against the virtues, the charity of heart, the devotion to duty, the capacity for friendship, before arriving at the synthesis. With the portrait, satisfying in itself and invaluable for the light it throws upon Southey's relations with his great contemporaries, particularly Coleridge and Wordsworth, Mr. Simmons offers a critical reassessment of Southey's achievement in literature.

His estimate of the poetry is, surprisingly, low. Southey's chief contribution to English verse, he thinks, is the handful of short lyrical pieces like "The Holly Tree" and the "Library Stanzas." But surely the exquisite ballads, "After Blenheim," "The Inchcape Rock," etc., with their undying popular appeal, represent a greater achievement. He praises *Kehama* as "a poem of real distinction and even splendour;" but, unlike the laureate himself and the small but fervent chorus of admirers with Cardinal Newman at the head, finds little of value in the other epics beyond marked power of narrative and description. "Southey's poetry has no magic: it does not sing."

"For the huge, delightful legacy of his prose" Mr. Simmons makes high claims. "Here he is a master beyond dispute, an artist of a high order;" and he argues Southey's significance in an amazingly wide field, as historian, biographer, essayist, translator of Spanish romances, and letter-writer. He describes Southey's style as crystal-clear and completely self-effacing; the impression left by his prose is "one of complete simplicity, sincerity, and truth."

Carefully winnowing the plentiful chaff from the solid grain, Mr. Simmons gives special attention to Southey's sociological thought. He shows that the proposals in the *Quarterly* and the *Colloquies* for the betterment of the condition of the poor and for other measures of practical reform (Southey's "Later Radicalism," as Mr. Haller entitled them in a noteworthy article in *PMLA* in 1922) had a profound influence upon the development of progressive ideas in England. A century after the famous and scathing *Edinburgh* review of the *Colloquies*, when many of the derided views have become

practical politics, "our sympathies are with Southey rather than Macaulay."

Mr. Simmons voices the need for a general selection from the intimidating bulk of Southey's prose. No one is better qualified than he to accept the challenge. By the attractive use he has made of vitally important material in unpublished letters, he makes an equally strong case for a comprehensive edition of all Southey's extant correspondence. It is good to be reminded that a sympathetic American scholar, Mr. Kenneth Curry, has this task in hand. For it is in the letters, among them some of the most delightful in the language, that Southey reveals himself as greater and better than any of his works; and to seek him there is to find a friend for life.

Mr. Simmons' book first appeared in 1945.

BERTRAM R. DAVIS

Bristol England

English Blake. By BERNARD BLACKSTONE. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press. xviii + 455 pp. \$6.50.

The first half of this book is a rapid review of Blake's poems in chronological order. The commentary is too brief to go very deeply into the subject at any point, but it makes a good reference guide. This is held together by a skeleton of biography, which repeats the old Gilchrist chestnuts rather uncritically: some of Gilchrist's anecdotes, one feels, belong less to a life of Blake than to a Theophrastan Character of the Eccentric Artist. For those with a special interest in Blake, the best thing in these two hundred pages is a good concise account of the background of *An Island in the Moon*. Mr. Blackstone dips a cautious toe into the symbolism, but decides, no doubt with most readers' sympathy, not to plunge too far below the surface. Only in a few trivial cases does one wish for more careful study of it: thus Blake's outline of history is divided into six ages on p. 71, and three on p. 203, but Blake's own directive consistently gives seven.

The second part consists of essays on different aspects of Blake's thought. The discussion of Blake's social and ethical views is rather oppressed by some heavy irony directed against both eighteenth-century and modern hypocrisies, but it presents the essential humanity of Blake with great sympathy and clarity. Mr. Blackstone takes Blake seriously, and never patronizes him or pretends to have reached a more balanced outlook himself, like many of Blake's critics. (In passing, I cannot believe Mr. Blackstone's suggestion that Blake resented his own monogamy or found his marriage unsatisfying: in Catherine Blake's pictures there is

a humorous twist to her mouth which suggests that for all her simplicity—or because of it—she understood Blake far better than we do.) He is also quite sound on Blake's attitude to religion and art, though he deals with Blake's general emotional reaction rather than with the specific details of his thought. Thus the final chapter on "Art" mentions all the things that Blake hated, but says nothing about his conception of outline. The chief aspect of Blake neglected is his relation to English literature. His immense debt to eighteenth-century poetry is greatly underestimated, and the discussions of Milton and of Pope's *Essay on Man* are among the least satisfactory parts of the book.

The most distinctive feature of Mr. Blackstone's approach, as compared with other critics, is his sense of Blake's close relation to English philosophy. Working from Blake's express statement that he had carefully read the *Advancement of Learning* and the *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, Mr. Blackstone goes through Bacon, Newton and Locke and shows how deeply the design of their thought was etched in reverse on Blake's mind. Blake's hostility to them implies a corresponding affinity with Berkeley, and Mr. Blackstone illustrates some of these affinities in detail. Blake's reading of Berkeley cannot be definitely proved except for the *Siris*, which proves very little, but the assumption that he knew the *Principles* at least is reasonable enough. In any case the passages in Berkeley which Mr. Blackstone considers to be sources for passages in Blake would do just as well as analogues. Blake, says Mr. Blackstone, "repudiated the doctrine that Nature works by secondary causes, that time and space are real and are the theatre of motion in which only primary qualities are concerned, and that secondary qualities are less 'real' than primary ones." All of this is quite true, and he shows very ably how for Blake the refusal to believe that secondary qualities are secondary opens the mind to a great rush of "minute particulars" of colors and sounds and perfumes.

The quality of the writing improves steadily in vigor and point as the book goes on. Mr. Blackstone is at his best when expounding Blake and speaking from Blake's point of view, and he quotes very well. In the earlier part of the book there are too many vague generalizations about the history of European thought, and he is too easily satisfied with the sort of cliché which is not sharply enough focussed in meaning to be either true or false (*e.g.*, p. 141: "Protestantism bows to the authority of the Bible; but the Bible is to be interpreted by each believer according to his own inner light"). Even in dealing with Blake himself, he shows some awkwardness in handling philosophical statements. He says on p. 241: "We may say that the greater part of his writing is an attempt to express what is ultimately inexpressible." We may say nothing of the kind: Blake had no more concern with the inexpress-

sible than a logician has with the unknowable. On p. 69: "Blake was primarily interested not in poetry but in truth." No such antithesis was capable of entering Blake's mind on any terms, as Mr. Blackstone must know. On p. 237 Blake is said to attack "the futility of scientific research, which seeks to discover causes of phenomena in the phenomenal multiverse itself and not in the noumenal world which lies behind." Blake knows nothing of any noumenal world lying, like Milton's Paradise of Fools, "o'er the backside of the World far off": he is no post-Kantian romantic, nor is he interested in acquiring any such sophisticated equivalent of a Polynesian's *mana*. Mr. Blackstone seems more at home with the Oriental mystics, and his comments on them are all too brief.

Such lapses are not inherent in the author's thinking; they seem to result chiefly from the prolixity of the book, which is much too long. Mr. Blackstone seems unaware that a great deal of what he says has been said before; perhaps, as he gives very few signs of having read any critic of Blake later than Gilchrist, he actually is unaware of it. But scholarly work on Blake is too well organized by now for such primitivism to be any longer a virtue. Nevertheless, his book can be recommended as a good all-round introduction to Blake for the general reader. Reduced to two-thirds or less of its present bulk, it would make an admirable one.

NORTHROP FRYE

Victoria College, Toronto

William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century. By GILBERT THOMAS.

London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1949. Pp. ix 347.
\$4.00.

A new edition of Mr. Thomas's study, originally issued in 1935, emphasizes the persistence of a very old debate concerning the religious implications of Cowper's madness. The argument, actually begun during Cowper's lifetime, was warmly pursued between the poet's death in 1800 and the almost simultaneous appearance of biographies by Southey and Grimshawe in 1835. Hayley's guarded suggestion that much of the responsibility for Cowper's madness might fall on Evangelicalism in general and on John Newton in particular received far bolder statement in Southey, whose anti-Evangelical prejudices were strong. Reverend gentlemen like Samuel Greatheed and Thomas Grimshawe emerged as staunch Evangelical apologists. The debate went on not only in the biographies but in periodical criticism, in which repugnance for Methodism and Evangelicalism often received vivid expression.

Throughout the nineteenth century the debate ran a steady, though, in the main, an unobtrusive course. In 1928 the subject

was reopened by Mr. Hugh I' A. Fausset's energetically wrong-headed and briskly anti-religious study of Cowper. Lord David Cecil's charmingly written biography of 1929 was non-controversial, but its presentation of the poet as an elegantly pathetic period piece and its suggestion of the ultimate inadequacy of Evangelicalism to heal Cowper's mind could hardly be accepted as telling the whole story either of the man or of his religious dilemma. Mr. Thomas's study is frankly controversial and equally frankly pro-Methodist, if not exactly pro-Evangelical. The latter circumstance gives the book a special place in the controversy, though not always one avoiding a further confusion of the issues.¹ Instead of making a blanket defence of Evangelicalism in Cowper's case, Mr. Thomas insists upon a cleaner dichotomy between the Calvinistic and Arminian elements of the Movement than many an eighteenth-century Evangelical would have readily perceived; and, having established such a dichotomy, he argues that Cowper's mental healing might have been effected had he been influenced by Arminian rather than by Calvinistic thought. Thus, Mr. Thomas's position essentially substitutes Calvinism as a scapegoat instead of the whole of Evangelicalism as Fausset would have it.

Like his immediate predecessors, Mr. Thomas has made no significant contribution to the biographical material. (In spite of their many faults, Southey and the late Thomas Wright remain the only biographers really worthy of the name.) The title of the book, which in the new edition incorporates only insignificant changes, is something of a misnomer, since the principal emphasis of the work is on Cowper's relationship to the Evangelical Movement rather than to the century in general. Throughout, the book is lively and readable. Its critical insights are often valuable, and its insistence on Cowper's manliness and essential sanity of utterance is eminently sound. Its fundamental weakness is its dialectic—a state resulting in elaborate refutation of contrary positions so extreme as to need little argument, as well as in refutation of contrary positions that are more imaginary than real. Nor can the argument escape completely the suggestion of special pleading. The haphazard annotation of the book and the absence of a complete bibliography make intelligent use difficult for the student.

Both Fausset and Thomas suffer from their attempted compromise between biographical narrative and polemic. Subsequent studies of Cowper's religious thought by Keck, Thein, Lanham, and Quinlan (some of them, unfortunately, unpublished) have looked at the subject with more scholarly detachment. So far as Cowper's madness is concerned, the definitive study will, we hope, be more particularly concerned with its basic nature and its total significance than with futile conjectures about how much less

¹ See my own "Cowper and the Evangelicals: Notes on Early Biographical Interpretations," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 721, 729-30.

tortured the poet might have been had his religious milieu been other than it was.

LODWICK HARTLEY

North Carolina State College

The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry. By JOHN ARTHOS. University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, vol. xxiv. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press; 1949. Pp. xiv + 463. \$6.00.

I approach this book with the handicap of having myself recently written one which exhibits certain broadly similar features—a concern with post-Galilean scientific diction and the arrangement of specimens in a lexical appendix. Predisposed to recognize not only the interest of the subject but the difficulty of documenting it without extensive resort to the alphabet, I may, however, enjoy a view of it which is already too microscopic.

Mr. Arthos illustrates a select vocabulary of English nature description from a wide range of sources, poetic, scientific, philosophic, in Greek, Latin, English, and several Romance languages. His reading in the secondary literature of linguistic and scientific history has been extensive and judicious. The frame of reference which he constructs around the vignette of English eighteenth-century nature description is spacious, like the implications of the words investigated. The chief critical points made by the book seem to me to be: (1) that the stock or "fixed" vocabulary of English nature description (much apparently depends on whether one says "stock" or "fixed") was a function of a "fixed" or stable view of the world; (2) that the system of cosmological ideas which composed this view had prevailed continuously, though with gradual shifts of emphasis, from pre-Socratic to Newtonian times; (3) that the language of nature poetry, especially of didactic nature poetry, during this period (e. g., the poetic diction of Virgil, Du Bartas, Blackmore) is closer to the language of science and philosophy (that of Pliny, Bartholomeus Anglicus, Boyle) than has ordinarily been supposed.

The well-known -y epithet (*leafy, branchy, wavy, woolly, finny, scaly*) is a part of poetic diction which one may be surprised to find so extensively illustrated by Mr. Arthos (in his Appendix C) from the descriptive scientists (Dampier, Evelyn, or the *Philosophic Transactions*). The basic philosophic concepts expressed by terms like *element, liquid, matter, humor*, one would expect to find in the scientists, but Mr. Arthos provides in Appendix A families of illustrations, as well as a number of philological essays, which go beyond any usual apparatus for tracing such history. Appendix A,

by far the weightiest section of the book, including 267 of its 463 pages, presents about 125 select words "Significant in Eighteenth-Century Poetry." The relatively small number of words included in so many pages will suggest the generosity of the illustrations and essays. The word *element*, for example, is treated in 14 pages, the word *kind* in 14, the word *vital* in 7, the word *paint* in 4. No doubt this Appendix will have its use as a kind of *Gradus* to criticism of nature diction in the mode already brilliantly demonstrated by Mr. Tillotson for certain of Pope's uses of stock words. Yet I wonder whether there may not be more illustration than one is likely to need, and whether a greater number of words, less copiously illustrated, might not better serve the end of even so specialized a lexicon.

A more serious misgiving which I entertain about the scope of the whole book is that—despite the many poems quoted—it does not after all bring us very close to poetry. Something more about the difference between science and poems might have been expected—something about what happens to scientific diction when it appears in poems, about metaphor, one of the prime agents for transmitting scientific into poetic, and about the poetic interplay of such philosophic Latin and Greek words as *aether*, *ambient*, *augment*, *distil*, *diurnal* with the many non-learned and homely stock words, some of which also appear in Appendix A—*brood*, *flock*, *fry*, *herd*, *scour*, *scud*, *slide*. The five discursive chapters with which the book begins are disappointing too on other grounds. I applaud the emphatic statement (pp. 2-3) that the hackneyed depends on irrelevance to context, and I believe an important critical avenue is entered (p. 17) when two-word periphrases are related to the principle of definition. But more logic may be needed for the latter point—to distinguish, for example, between *liquid air*, where the adjective is added to an already specific term which implies it, and *scaly kind*, where the adjective added to the generic term tells what kind. Chapter III, on the characteristics of scientific language, makes some good points about periphrase, compounds, specialization, and intelligibility, but might be much more decisively ordered. Chapters IV and V treat the continuity and evolution of basic concepts in science and poetry from antiquity to the eighteenth century. The affinity of the ancient *elements* to various versions of cosmological order or purpose (p. 51) is a point worth making. But throughout these two chapters, pp. 63, 67, 82-84, there is a cumulative shuffling together of teleology, animism, personification, and homocentricity until on p. 85, with Thomson and Newton, "The *anima mundi*, or however the central life of the universe might be conceived, had disappeared, the teleological view of things was destroyed." Strange news in the last clause, I should say, for Thomson or Newton, for Boyle, Bentley, or Derham. The philosophic scaffolding set up rather repetitiously in these two chapters appears to me to be in excess of any actual critical application.

To speak more broadly, the root of what I object to in Mr. Arthos' five chapters lies largely in the organization and style. Though the documentation shows pinpoint accuracy, the writing is loose, uneconomical, and uncertain. The quotations from secondary authorities are too many, too long, and too little assimilated. Advertising phrases of introduction or conclusion, such as "it is important to note," occur too often, and without concretely organized demonstration why something is actually important.

W. K. WIMSATT, JR.

Yale University

The Triumph of Form. A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet. By WALLACE CABLE BROWN. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948. Pp. x + 212. \$3.50.

Professor Wallace C. Brown in *The Triumph of Form* discusses, from a "critical" point of view, the heroic couplet poems of seven writers—Gay, Johnson, Churchill, Young, Cowper, Goldsmith, and Crabbe—who followed Dryden and Pope and who demonstrated "not only technical mastery, but also superior achievement in poetic structure and in synthesis of style and content." Because the author understands and appreciates the varied effects of which this verse form is capable, his analyses and conclusions are often subtle and stimulating; one will find the chapters on Johnson and Churchill particularly so. It is unfortunate that the least satisfactory section should be the first, which deals chiefly with Pope and Dryden and sets the stage for the individual studies that follow. This chapter contains a general discussion marked by frequent quotation from the authorities—in the best tradition of the "new" criticism—and concludes with the bland and frustrating statement that the work of Yvor Winters, Mark Van Doren, and George Williamson, for example, "makes further detailed interpretation unnecessary" (p. 43). However perceptive the work of other critics has been, a writer's responsibilities cannot so easily be shifted.

The unifying element in the book is the thesis that the later masters of the couplet who are here studied preserved the essential integrity of the couplet form, though each introduced distinctive patterns of variation adapted to his own modes of expression. Not troubled by uncritical but orthodox preconceptions about the excessive rigidity of the form, Professor Brown ably demonstrates its various technical resources and shows characteristic patterns of variation in each author he studies. His insights are just, and he generally avoids confusing interpretative freedom with interpreta-

tive irresponsibility. One will perhaps believe that he, along with many others who have recently treated the heroic couplet, emphasizes unduly what is variously called the suppressed accent, the pyrrhic foot, or the four-stressed line. Such emphasis assumes, somewhat arbitrarily and unjustly, that there is either a full accent or none at all; and it ignores the fact that many examples of pyrrhic feet cited are more correctly to be regarded as weakly stressed iambs. Though the pyrrhic foot was used on occasion for rhythmic variation by eighteenth-century poets, recent critics who profess to see very frequent instances of it disregard both eighteenth-century linguistic practices and prosodic theory.

Some will find that Professor Brown forces a point in many of his efforts to link the seven poets to a tradition characteristic of Dryden and / or a second tradition characteristic of Pope—technical aspects of which are called the "Pope formula" (Do I detect a hint of disparagement here?). The points upon which this distinction is made are frequently vague and occasionally meaningless. That Johnson follows Pope any more than Dryden in forcing "the didactic-satiric poem into lyrical territory" is a tenuous, if not impossible distinction; that Crabbe resembles Dryden rather than Pope in his restriction of the couplet to narrative is, in the face of the *Religio Laici* of Dryden or the *Rape of the Lock* or the *Dunciad* of Pope, scarcely tenable. And distinctions between Dryden and Pope on the basis of purely technical practices must be considered weak when characteristics of Pope's prosody are drawn only from the early poems. This failure to take into account differences between Pope's early metrical practices and those of his later works makes the "Pope formula" a meaningless one.

I should also like to call attention to the advisability of basing technical studies of the kind Professor Brown has undertaken upon original eighteenth-century editions of poems rather than upon standard editions, so notorious for free-wheeling in matters of punctuation and elision. Because such changes easily alter the cast of the couplet, critics treating the prosody of eighteenth-century poetry should make more use of the texts the poets themselves supervised and proof-read.

My criticisms and suggestions must not obscure the real merits of Professor Brown's book. He understands that technical matters of versification are always subordinate to meaning and poetic effect, and his critical acumen leads him to many fresh, original, and provocative observations about the poets with whom he is concerned. His work, showing how a number of specific poets have, each in his own way, made the couplet varied and expressive, ranks alongside other commendable efforts to restore the heroic couplet to respectability.

ROBERT W. ROGERS

University of Illinois

Sir Richard Blackmore and the Wits. By RICHARD C. BOYS. University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, Number 13. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949. Pp. x + 152. \$2.50.

Professor Boys is concerned with the noisy quarrel between Sir Richard Blackmore and the wits of Dryden's circle, a quarrel that culminated in the publication (1700) of two collections of lampooning verses, *Commendatory Verses on the Author of the Two Arthurs, and the Satyr against Wit* and *Discommendatory Verses, on Those Which Are Truly Commendatory, on the Author of the Two Arthurs, and the Satyr against Wit*. He presents much fragmentary and scattered evidence in an effort to identify contributors to *Commendatory Verses*,—particularly illuminating is his discovery of the identity of "O. S." He devotes a considerable portion of the book to a reprinting of the texts of the two collections, an undertaking that readers will welcome in view of the relative rarity of the pamphlets. Furthermore, although these two collections and the immediate problems they raise are the chief business of his book, Professor Boys provides a lucid account of the development of the whole quarrel, concisely stating general critical issues involved and ably demonstrating the way in which significant contemporary quarrels may have influenced the ideas emphasized in this one. For he sees a good deal more in the feud than a conflict of personalities: he views it as a demonstration of current attitudes towards literature and as a reflection of a small but important part of "the great social struggle which eventually resulted in the firm establishment of bourgeois ideals in literature as well as in society." It is regrettable, however, that the book, designed to be a definitive treatment of a paragraph in literary history, should evidence short-comings.

Daniel Defoe's *Pacificator*, which appeared in February, 1700, just before the publication of *Commendatory Verses*, has apparently been overlooked; for it is not mentioned in the discussion, and it is not listed in Appendix B, "Chronology of Works in 1700 Related to *Commendatory Verses*." Yet Defoe's poem is solely concerned with the quarrel: in it, although Defoe recommends moderation and good sense to both groups of participants, he is obviously sympathetic with Blackmore's cause. *The Pacificator*, had it been considered, would have forced some qualification in the assertion (p. 46 n.) that there is no evidence, other than a conjecture, that Defoe was directly mixed up in the polemics of *Contemporary Verses*. It would also have provided a valuable contemporary account of the whole quarrel between Blackmore and the Wits, an account that would surely have helped in Professor Boys's task of identifying participants.

There is less exactitude than one may reasonably hope for in a

scholarly work on a minor topic that will not soon be treated again. Symptomatic of this weakness is the treatment of problems involved in reproducing the text. Readers are given no detailed statement of editorial principles; but several typographical features of the transcription require explanation. And, although an exact rendering seems to have been intended, one is not told from which of the two editions of *Commendatory Verses* the text of that collection is drawn. Since a reprinting was involved, a statement of this kind would not have been superfluous. Furthermore, the bibliographical descriptions are not effectively presented. Relevant, often vital information is not compactly organized but is scattered in footnotes throughout the book so that a reader must dig for answers to questions that will inevitably occur to him; and the general looseness with which bibliographical terminology is used creates more unnecessary confusion. A hasty collation of the text with original copies available to me indicates that, on the whole, the transcription is accurate. My collation, however, has turned up the following significant verbal discrepancies (In giving line numbers, I am using lines of print on the page, excluding the running-head.) : p. 62, l. 23, as Citizens should be Citizens; p. 66, l. 28, Subject should be Subjects; p. 77, l. 17, has, hast; p. 83, l. 14, you, you'd; p. 102, l. 19, making Squibbs, Squibbs; p. 105, l. 16, fumbling, rumbling; p. 112, l. 22, Fool, Fools; p. 117 l. 16, the, a; p. 126, l. 29, for, by; p. 128, l. 11, Grace, Grave; p. 129, l. 26, I, In. One may also ask why the "Advertisement" at the bottom of p. 28 of *Commendatory Verses* was not reproduced along with the rest of the text; obviously it was part of the jest at Blackmore's expense.

ROBERT W. ROGERS

University of Illinois

Dr. Johnson and the Law. By SIR ARNOLD McNAIR, K. C. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948. Pp. xii + 115. \$2.00.

Sir Arnold McNair is a distinguished British jurist who has, in his admiration for Dr. Johnson, put together an interesting little book. He makes no claims to expertness as a Johnsonian scholar, but he knows his Boswell, which is a key to both the virtues of the book and its principal shortcomings, for it is stronger on Johnson as quoted in the *Life* and the *Tour* (and the letters) than on Johnson's works. The *Western Islands*, the *Rambler* and *Idler*, and *Taxation no Tyranny* are quoted, but the large number of Johnson's other works are left in silence—the *Dictionary*, the notes to Shakespeare, the *Lives of the Poets*, the *Parliamentary Debates*, and so on. He refers to *The False Alarm*, but it is not evident that he has read it, and he speaks contemptuously of the

Booksellers' edition of Johnson's works (1787) in what seems to be an echo.

Sir Arnold's use of earlier scholarship is sporadic. He treats in some detail an article of mine which appeared in England in 1939, but he missed the second part of the article, which followed in the same journal a few months later. He also notes my discovery of the manuscript, in eighteen volumes, of the Chambers lectures on the law, in which Johnson assisted, but he did not have the time, apparently, to look at the manuscript in the British Museum. It may be captious, however, to expect more of a book written on an avocation.

A layman, particularly an American layman, will experience occasional trouble in this book, since Sir Arnold uses technical terms frequently, makes the reader consult his dictionary for strange abbreviations, and offers little help in the unfamiliar ways of eighteenth-century practice. Indeed, it is not easy to avoid either talking down to the legal profession, or losing the layman's interest.

I will finish my objections before noting the virtues of the book. Sir Arnold is mistaken in thinking that an imitation of Johnson's style "dating back at least as far as 1790" is unlikely. There were many in Johnson's lifetime. And the suggestion that Chambers was a candidate for the first Vinerian Professorship in 1758 falls to the ground when one remembers that Chambers was just twenty-one, and far from the ten years beyond matriculation required by the Vinerian Statutes, not to mention that Blackstone held the appointment in his hand, and was easily elected. One of Sir Arnold's leads was promising—a notion that a record of payment for a missing work by Johnson on behalf of the East India Company might be found in the files of the Company, but search proved fruitless. This required mention, but not the space devoted to it, including even the reproduction of some of the records. And finally a more rigid control would never allow an author to say, "I must continue, though what follows is irrelevant" (p. 27).

Balanced against this rather extensive list of faults is a good budget of virtues. Even an irrelevance may be amusing or instructive, as is the one just mentioned. Two of the most informative pages of the book are devoted to the rise of "reading" for the law in a solicitor's office, a rather new approach to the profession in the eighteenth century. Moreover, there are many lively sketches of the great lawyers of the period, and an interesting speculation, with which I find myself in general agreement, on what Johnson might have made of a legal career. As to Johnson's approach to law, Sir Arnold summarizes neatly:

I believe it to be fair judgement to say that he had a general *acquaintance* with legal principles and institutions such as would be gathered from miscellaneous legal reading and particularly from books on the Law of Nature purporting to deal with law as a general and universal body of

principles; . . . but that there is little evidence of systematic *knowledge* of the rules of any one legal system, Roman or English or Scots. He was more interested in legal conceptions and institutions as the expression of the needs or traditions of a society than in precise rules and their application.

E. L. MCADAM, JR.

New York University.

Nineteenth Century Studies. By BASIL WILLEY. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. P. 283. \$4.00.

Professor Willey's third study in the background of English literature concentrates upon the history of religious and moral ideas in the nineteenth century: a strategic choice, since the future of poetry was bound up in the ability of the Christian religion and ethics to survive the assaults of mechanistic science. So various and complex were the issues, that even by limiting attention to seven representative writers Mr. Willey has been obliged to break off with Matthew Arnold and to reserve the completion of his story for a future volume. "The nineteenth century," he confesses, "compels us to define our own position, and as this is difficult and often painful, we have (until recently) avoided its society like prodigal sons, or by-passed it with a superficial irony . . . It can still challenge us, and compel us, in the name of honesty and self-respect, to declare in what way we think we have improved upon it, outgrown it, or transcended its standpoint." So he accompanies his exposition with personal evaluations, and we, his contemporaries, chastened by the thirty years since Lytton Strachey, agonize or rejoice with him. The book is an experience to be lived through.

At the opening of the nineteenth century, Christian religion and ethics met mechanistic science, which denied miracles, evaluated human actions quantitatively in amounts of pleasure and pain and subverted the social gospel of Jesus by the abstraction of the "economic man" and an atomistic theory of politics. They had also to adjust themselves to the novel fact of rapid social change and to the new conception of history as a process of organic development, not only of institutions, but also of ideas, beliefs and ideals. Orthodox Protestantism, both Anglican and Evangelical, fixing faith in a literally inspired and statically interpreted Bible, viewed the historical spirit and science with equal alarm; but certain men of letters perceived in the former an ally of religion and poetry. For while analytic science promoted a habit of mind incapable of understanding symbol, parable, myth and legend, the new history, by giving them fuller meaning, enriched poetry and religion alike.

With Coleridge, whom experience of poetic creation had taken to the borders of the supernatural, Mr. Willey's narrative begins.

His defence of Coleridge's distinction between Imagination and Fancy—an impressive feat of interpretation—not only shows how poetry can be an approach to truth but prepares the reader to comprehend Coleridge's parallel distinction of Reason from Understanding, which puts perception of religious and ethical truth on ground unassailable by science. To oppose the tendency of analysis and specialization to reduce the universe to "an immense heap of little things," Coleridge built upon his insight into the nature of poetry, religion and history and upon his faith in the Christian social gospel a progressive-conservative synthesis which included economics, politics, ethics and education. This synthesis was buttressed and refined by later thinkers. Coleridge's conception of the Church, rather than the Bible, as the custodian of progressively revealed religion pointed to Newman and to Thomas and Matthew Arnold: his conception of the State as an instrument for Christianizing the social order, to the two Arnolds and Carlyle. Coleridge's wise foresight in preparing English minds to meet historical Biblical scholarship Mr. Willey illustrates by the unhappiness of George Eliot, who had not been so prepared, in her bleak negations. He measures the cumulative strength of this progressive-conservatism by its effect upon John Stuart Mill, who had been educated to deny its premises. With Matthew Arnold, "a new phenomenon, the 'literary' intelligence playing freely upon the great concerns of life" and finding the strongest part of popular religion in its "unconscious poetry," Professor Willey's narrative comes to a temporary halt in an auspicious harmony of intellect, taste and spiritual perception. But he has warned his readers that such harmony was not to prevail: "In our own time the task of poets has become harder than ever; they must resist and subdue a world far colder and more hostile than Coleridge's."

No brief summary can more than hint at the profundity and variety of this book. Mr. Willey offers no bibliography; for he has gone directly to primary materials and has interpreted them by mature knowledge and wisdom, by spiritual, ethical and aesthetic sensibility. His earnestness banishes neither grace nor humor. Within the beautifully articulated design of the whole there are continual felicities of phrase; after following the central theme to conclusion one returns to dwell upon riches thrown out in passing, such as the fresh comments on Carlyle's language and style. Since Mr. Willey proposes to "fill in some of the gaps" when preparing his next volume, perhaps he will more often widen our vision beyond the English scene; possibly by comparing Coleridge's synthesis with that of Goethe or Herder, and by pointing to Renan as well as Arnold as the literary intelligence playing freely upon the great concerns of life.

EMERY NEFF

Columbia University

René Boylesve et le problème de l'amour. By ANDRÉ BOURGEOIS.
Lille: Giard, and Genève: Droz, 1950. Pp. 173.

After having studied, in *René Boylesve: l'homme, le peintre de la Touraine* (Paris, Droz, 1945), the "romans tourangeaux" of Boylesve, Prof. Bourgeois concerns himself in the present monograph with the "romans d'amour," and he promises us a third volume, *René Boylesve et le problème de l'éducation*. He is, thus, one of the most devoted Boylesvians of our generation, and he writes with a love of his subject and boldness in its treatment which will doubtless materially assist in keeping alive the memory of a novelist whose soberly sensitive artistry had its roots in deeply felt experience and worldly-wise disillusionment.

The chief contention of the present study is that Boylesve was neither "l'ennemi de l'amour," as the title of M. Gérard-Gailly's monograph makes him out, nor the "peintre de l'amour," as some of his admirers consider him, but the "victime de l'amour" (p. 169). To prove this contention, Prof. B. repeatedly insists on the following unhappy experiences in the novelist's life: the death of his mother when he was only four, his timid relations with a young girl named Louise Renaut, who married when he was about twenty and whom he had never dared tell of his love, his love-affair with Marie B., "l'héroïne encore inconnue de Sainte-Marie-des-Fleurs" (p. 57), and his unwilling and unhappy marriage, in 1901, to Alice Mors. In studying the reflections of these episodes in Boylesve's "romans d'amour," Prof. B. makes use of an elaborate and sometimes terrifying battery of psychoanalytical terms to diagnose the novelist's attitudes towards the various manifestations of physical and spiritual love. Boylesve, we are told, suffered from a "névrose qui résulte de son complexe d'Oedipe jamais liquidé" (p. 25). His mother's death "causa un traumatisme psychique qui faussa à jamais sa conception de l'amour,— De là naquit inconsciemment un sentiment d'infériorité, d'indignité, de futilité qui se retrouve dans chacune de ses aventures amoureuses" (pp. 33-34). His failure to ask for the hand of Louise Renaut in marriage was the result of "un complexe qui fit de lui, du point de vue amour, un cas psychopathique" (p. 51), the complex being, specifically, "une infantile fixation sentimentale à la mère" (p. 53). Because he was riddled with "inhibitions" and because "la notion de l'amour avait perdu à tout jamais pour lui tout élément physique" (p. 61), Boylesve was unable to bring to a culmination his love-affair with Marie B. and his marriage was a total failure. All this is summed up in the final sentence:

à jamais esclave d'un complexe né de son amour pour sa mère, développé par son amour pour Louise Renaut et renforcé par son amour pour Marie, il refusa d'entendre la vérité chaque fois que la voix de son subconscient, ému par un amour normal et sain, réussit à percer le mur des dangereuses inhibitions qui empoisonnèrent son existence, qui développèrent en lui une névrose faite de narcissisme et de masochisme (p. 169).

And as though to drive home his point with sledge-hammer blows, Prof. B. several times makes a *rapprochement* between Boylesve and Baudelaire (pp. 63, 142, 144) which seems, to put it mildly, rather far-fetched.

With the aid of this psychoanalytical apparatus, Prof. B. studies the characters and basic situations of such novels as *Sainte-Marie-des-Fleurs*, *le Parfum des îles Borromées*, *la Leçon d'amour dans un parc* and its sequels, *le Bel avenir*, *Mon amour*, and *Souvenirs du jardin détruit* in a manner that is often exciting and illuminating, and sometimes irritating. Despite occasional admissions that his inferences are mere "conjectures" (pp. 44, 51, 53), one has the feeling that Prof. B. proves too much from too little. As evidence of Boylesve's "mother-fixation," he cites the opening chapter of *la Becquée* and particularly the words: "Elle m'attira et me tint longtemps près de sa joue" (p. 21). Under the circumstances, this was the most normal behavior imaginable. And he fails to cite, from this same chapter, the end of the final conversation between mother and son and the latter's belated after-thought:

"Au moins, es-tu content d'aller à Courance?"
"Oui."

Et je lui aurais fait tant de plaisir en lui disant: "Cela m'ennuie de te quitter!" Mais j'ai pensé à dire cela vingt ans plus tard.¹

It would seem difficult to read into these sober lines a "non-liquided Oedipus complex." And if it is true, as Prof. B. himself admits in his first volume, that the "études de mœurs provinciales forment probablement la partie la plus solide de son œuvre et celle qui restera la plus vivante,"² much of the psychoanalysis in the present work seems beside the point, since love plays a very minor role in the Tourangeau novels. One calls to mind, with Jean-Louis Vaudoyer, Boylesve's "silhouette discrète, sa permanente et précautionneuse courtoisie, son goût pour le mezzo-voce, en dépit d'une clairvoyance féroce,"³ and one can scarcely envisage him as a character in *Mourning Becomes Electra*.

The importance, then, of *René Boylesve et le problème de l'amour* may be said to reside in the light it sheds on the emotional constitution of the novelist rather than on the literary qualities of his novels. The work possesses the warmth and style, and sometimes the self-centered digressions, of the personal essay and certainly presents a Boylesve whose existence could hardly be suspected by the reader of only such works as *Mademoiselle Cloque* and *la Becquée*. Externally, it has the advantages of an attractive format and very legible typography. There is no bibliography of secondary

¹ *La Becquée*, 5th ed., Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1920, p. 20.

² René Boylesve: *l'homme, le peintre de la Touraine*, p. 129.

³ Quoted from a review of Vaudoyer's *Dédicé à l'amitié et au souvenir*, Paris, Plon, 1947, in *les Lettres romanes*, tome IV, no. 2, May 1950, p. 181.

sources, but, as Prof. B. cites only some half-dozen of these, he obviously deemed one unnecessary. Misprints are few and, except for the repeated use of the singular form in the title of *Souvenirs du jardin détruit*, relatively unimportant. Because of the provocative character of the two volumes that have appeared, one may look forward to the presentation of further new viewpoints in *René Boylesve et le problème de l'éducation*.

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas

Russian Epic Studies, edited by ROMAN JAKOBSON and ERNEST J. SIMMONS. Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1949. Pp. 224.

The appearance of *Russian Epic Studies* within a year after *La Geste du Prince Igor'* is fortunate and well-timed. The *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (the *Lay of Prince Igor'*), as the only remnant of secular medieval Russian literature, has been treated too much as a curiosity; its investigators have perhaps been more than a bit disturbed by the consideration that the object of their research might be a forgery. At last, in *La Geste du Prince Igor'* Professor Jakobson and his associates (see review by Prof. René Wellek, *MLN*, 1948, pp. 502-3) have brilliantly and conclusively established the authenticity of the epic. Now, as a genuine monument of medieval Russian culture, it awaits the exhaustive and manifold research accorded the other great epics of world literature. In *Russian Epic Studies* Professors Jakobson and Simmons have gathered a group of articles which are precisely the fruit of such research. It is to be hoped that the editors are planning many more volumes of similar investigations and they are to be congratulated for helping to define the proper frame of reference for subsequent studies.

The first and longest work in the present volume, the result of the collaboration of Roman Jakobson and Marc Szeftel, presents a complete study of the motifs of Vseslav, the werewolf-prince, as they occur in the *Slovo*, the *Primary Chronicle* and various extant *byliny*, of which Vseslav is the hero. A careful comparison and analysis of the various details of the legend explain away many previous unclarities. The frequent juxtaposition of the *Slovo* and the various Vseslav *byliny* whet the appetite for a full analysis of the Igor' epic in the light of the oral epic tradition.

Le Digénis Russe by Professor Henri Grégoire (the only essay in the volume not in English) demonstrates with masterful logic and erudition that the only other secular text found in the manuscript containing the first-known version of the *Slovo* was trans-

lated from a Byzantine source more ancient than any extant Greek version. Grégoire contributes one more important finding to corroborate the authenticity of the *Slovo*.

If the two articles described are peripheral in relation to the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, the six that remain investigate problems connected directly with the epic. Clarence A. Manning and Margaret Schlauch consider, respectively, possible classical and Scandinavian influences. The first Polish translation of the work by Cyprian Gobedski in 1806 is examined by Manfred Kridl. Avraham Yarmolinsky offers a complete history of translations and studies of the work in English. The brief "On Alliteration in Ancient Russian Epic Literature" by Dmitry Čiževsky is the only article in the collection dealing with exclusively literary aspects of the *Slovo*. In addition to calling attention to the alliteration which binds the final words of short syntactic units, a not uncommon device in the work, Professor Čiževsky demonstrates that alliteration in general was a specific literary device of the Russian epic genre.

One of the most important features of *Russian Epic Studies* is the publication for the first time of the translation of the *Slovo* into German prose by Rainer Maria Rilke. The text is presented with an introduction and notes by André von Gronicka. The translation is one of the finest the reviewer has seen and clearly worthy of the translator. It is unfortunate that the manuscript was not received from Europe in time to appear with the other splendid translations in *La Geste*.

RICHARD BURGI

Yale University

BRIEF MENTION

Julius Cæsar. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. The New Shakespeare, edited by JOHN DOVER WILSON. London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1949. Front.; pp. xlii + 220. \$2.50. The text here provided is typically conservative; conservative too, although less typically, are the notes on the "copy." C. B. Young again furnishes a concise but interesting Stage History. The main critical effort of this edition is to demonstrate the structural unity of the play in terms of its true theme, "Cæsar and Cæsarism," to which subject the Introduction is chiefly devoted. Some readers, indeed, will wish that attention had also been given to certain other problems, such as the peculiarities of Brutus as a tragic hero. The Introduction is, in fact, considerably briefer than usual; but abundant compensation for this will be found in the more than usually generous Notes. Less controversial than many of the editions in this famous series, the present work is yet as stimulating and as richly suggestive as ever.

CHARLTON HINMAN

Zur Verfasserfrage der Königsberger Apostelgeschichte. Von ERKKI VALLI. (= Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Vol. LXI, 1). Helsinki, 1947. Pp. 63. In der Einleitung seiner Ausgabe der *Ostdeutschen Apostelgeschichte* aus der Handschrift Königsberg A 191 (Halle, 1927) hatte Ziesemer verblüffende Parallelstellen zwischen diesem Text und Claus Crancs *Prophetenübersetzung*—aus der gleichen Hs., wenn auch von anderer Hand geschrieben—nachgewiesen, aber in Anbetracht des zu dürftigen Vergleichsmaterials darauf verzichtet, Cranc mit der Verfasserschaft der Apostelgeschichte zu belasten: "Das wird sich erst durch eine eingehende Beschäftigung mit Sprache und Stil Crancs ermöglichen lassen." Die detaillierte Untersuchung liegt nun vor, ihr Ergebnis ist entschieden negativ. Ähnlichkeiten der beiden Texte beruhen auf der Identität der Ziele der beiden Übersetzer, auf der Identität des Sprachraums, aus dem sie stammen, auf gleichem Bildungsgang, Identität ihrer sozialen Umwelt, auf der Normung des Vokabulars, das ihnen für ein Bibeldeutsch zur Verfügung stand. In bedeutsamen Winzigkeiten schlägt dann die Individualität der *beiden* Übersetzer doch durch, so etwa im höchst persönlichen Gebrauch der Konjunktionen oder in der singularen Verwendung von *Volk* bei Cranc, der pluralen beim Anonymus. Lassen sich solche an sich unbeträchtlichen Einzelheiten häufen, so schließt die Gesamtheit der Divergenzen eine gemeinsame Verfasserschaft der beiden Texte doch nahezu völlig aus. Valli weist auch die an sich mögliche Annahme zurück, daß die anonyme Übersetzung eine Jugendarbeit Crancs sein könne; dann müsste sie allerdings vor 1348 entstanden sein, wogegen die kausale Verwendung von *den* (= denn) spricht, die hypermodern ist, auch wenn Behaghels Ansatz "seit Anfang des 15. Jh." sich offensichtlich um ein halbes Jahrhundert vergreift. Der anonyme Text hat sie, Cranc hat sie nicht. Es müsste also der alternde Cranc sein, der sie verwendet, aber *ihm* liesse sich die Apostelgeschichte nur als Jugendarbeit zuschreiben. Mithin scheidet er als Verfasser aus.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

The Ancient Mariner and the Authentic Narrative. By BERNARD MARTIN. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1949. Pp. vi + 82. 2 plates. 7sh. 6d. Mr. Martin reprints the first edition of *The Ancient Mariner* and ten pages of *An Authentic Narrative* (1764), the autobiography of Cowper's friend, John Newton. He shows that Coleridge probably knew Newton's work but is less convincing in his arguments that *The Ancient Mariner* was influenced by it.

R. D. H.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Cordasco, Francesco.—Edmund Burke: a handlist of critical notices & studies. *New York*: Long Is. U. Press, 1950. Pp. 12.

— Edward Young: a handlist of critical notices & studies. *Ibid.*, 1950. Pp. 9.

Prouty, Charles T.—The Sources of *Much Ado about Nothing*, a critical study, together with the text of Peter Beverley's *Ariodanto and Ieneura*. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1950. 142 pp. \$2.50.

Simon, Jean.—Le Roman américain au XX^e siècle. *Paris*: Boivin, 1950. Pp. 200.

GERMAN

Anno-Lied, Das.—Hrsg. v. Martin Opitz, 1639. Diplomat. Abdr. bes. v. Walter Bulst. [Editiones Heidelbergenses. H. 2]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1946. 55 pp. M. 1.50.

Baescke, Georg.—Die althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Taufgelöbnisse, [Nachrichten v. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1944, Nr. 3]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1944. Pp. 63-85. 4°. M. 3.-

Ermatinger, Emil.—Gottfried Kellers Leben. Mit Benützung von Jakob Baechtolds Biographie dargestellt: 8 neu bearb. Aufl. *Zürich*, Artemis-Verl. [1950]. 639 pp. Fr. 22.80.

Frings, Theodor.—Grundlegung einer Geschichte der deutschen Sprach. 2. erw. Aufl. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1950. 127 pp. M. 6.60.

Hankamer, Paul.—Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock. Die dt. Literatur im Zeitraum d. 17. Jh. [Epochen d. dt. Literatur. Bd. 2. Tl. 2]. *Stuttgart*: Metzler [1947]. viii, 543 pp. M. 22.-

Kaufmann, Walter A.—Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. *Princeton*, N. J.: University Press, 1950. 409 pp. \$6.00.

Kayser, Wolfgang.—Die iberische Welt im Denken J. G. Herders. [Ibero-Americanische Studien 17.]. *Hamburg*: Behre, 1945. 76 pp.

Nevar, Elga Maria.—Freundschaft mit Rainier Maria Rilke. Begegnungen, Gespräche, Briefe u. Aufzeichnungen mitgeteilt. [Winterthur]: A Züst [1946]. 215 pp. Fr. 13.80.

Rakers, Arnold.—Die Mundarten der alten Grafschaft Bentheim u. ihrer reichsdeutschen u. niederländischen Umgebung. Auf dialekt-geographisch-geschichtl. Grundlage. Mit e. Mundartatlas. [Veröffentlichungen d. Provinzial-Instituts f. Landesplanung u. Niedersächsische Landesforschung Hannover-Göttingen, Reihe A, Bd. 16.] *Oldenburg*: 1944. xvi, 238 pp. M. 9.-

Ranheimsaeter, Harald.—Flektierte und unflektierte Nominativformen im deutschen Adjektivsystem bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jhs. [Skrifter fra det germanistiske Seminar ved universitetet i Oslo. 1.] *Oslo*: J. G. Tanum, 1945. ix, 148 pp. 4°. Kr. 8.55.

Schneider, Hermann.—Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Nach ihren Epochen dargestellt. Bd. 1. *Bonn*: Athenäum-Verlag, 1949. 347 pp. M. 14.

— Über Entstehung, Träger und Wesen des Neuen in der Geschichte der Dichtkunst-Rede. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1950. 35 pp. M. 1.80. [Tübingen Universitätsreden, 1.].

Thurnherr, Eugen.—Wort u. Wesen in Südtirol. Die deutsche Dichtung Südtirols im Mittelalter. *Innsbruck*: Österr. Verlags-Anstalt, 1947. 240 pp. 4°. S. 29.

Trautmann, Reinhold.—Die elb- und ostseeslavischen Ortsnamen. T. 2. [Abh. d. Dt. Akademie d. Wiss. zu Berlin. Philos.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1947, Nr. 7.]. *Berlin*: Akademie-Verl. 1949. 119 pp. 4°. M. 12.-

Wyss, Dieter.—Der Surrealismus. Eine Einführung und Deutung surrealist. Literatur u. Malerei. *Heidelberg*: L. Schneider [1950]. 88 pp. 9 plates. M. 12.50.

SCANDINAVIAN

Downs, B. W.—A Study of Six Plays by Ibsen. Cambridge [and New York]: Cambridge U. Press, 1950. xii + 213 pp. \$3.00.

Schlauch, Margaret (tr.).—Three Icelandic Sagas. *Princeton*: U. Press for Am.-Scandinavian Foundation, 1950. 150 pp. \$3.00.

FRENCH

Ambrière, Francis.—La Galerie dramatique 1945-48, le théâtre français depuis la Libération. *Paris*: Corrèa, 1949. 403 pp. Fr. 600.

Ardoine, Paul.—Notes sur la jeunesse de Vauvenargues. *Paris*: Vrin, 1949. 24 pp.

Aubert, Jean (ed.).—Anthologie des poètes instituteurs. *Paris*: Eds. P. de Ronsard, 1949. 212 pp. Fr. 350.

Baldenne, Fernand. — Rimes d'exil et d'espoir. *Paris:* Belles Lettres, 1950. 116 pp.

Baronnet, Ernest. — Œuvres, éd. Prim Berland. *Auxerre:* Impr. universelle, 1949. 115 pp.

Barquissau, Raphaël. — Les Poètes créoles du XVIII^e siècle. *Paris:* Vigneau, 1949. 251 pp. Fr. 400.

Beausire, Pierre. — Mallarmé, poésie et poétique. *Lausanne:* Mermod, 1949. 233 pp.

Bédier, Hazard et Martino. — Littérature fr. T. II. *Paris:* Larousse, 1949. 512 pp. Fr. 3300.

Bonnet, Henri. — Le Progrès spirituel dans l'œuvre de Marcel Proust. *Paris:* Vrin, 1949. 294 pp. Fr. 600.

Bourgeois, André. — René Boylesve et le problème de l'amour. *Lille:* Giard; *Genève:* Droz, 1950. 173 pp.

Byrne, L. S. R., and E. L. Churchill. — A Comprehensive French Grammar. *Oxford:* Blackwell [N. Y.: Macmillan], 1950. xxiv + 515 pp. \$3.75.

Chesney, Kathleen (ed.). — Fleurs de Rhétorique from Villon to Marot. *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1950. 119 pp. 7/6.

Chevrier, Pierre. — Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. *Paris:* Gallimard, 1949. 328 pp. Fr. 400.

Dauzat, Albert. — Précis d'histoire de la langue et du vocab. fr. *Paris:* Larousse, 1949. 251 pp. Fr. 325.

Davies, Gardner. — Les Poèmes commémoratifs de Mallarmé. Paris diss., 1950. 234 pp.

Decahors, Elie. — Histoire de la litt. fr. T. I. Le Moyen âge. *Paris:* Eds. de l'Ecole, 1949. 302 pp. Fr. 520.

De Cesare, Raffaele. — Intorno a "Servitudo et grandeur militaires" di A. de Vigny. *Arona:* Ed. Paideia, 1949. 55 pp.

Donvez, Jacques. — De quoi vivait Voltaire? *Paris:* Deux rives, 1949. 181 pp. Fr. 250.

Dourbes, Pierre. — Daniel-Rops ou le Réalisme de l'esprit. *Paris:* Fayard, 1949. 259 pp. Fr. 300.

Dubeux, Albert. — La Curieuse vie de Georges Courteline. *Paris:* Nouv. libr. de Fr., 1949. 323 pp. Fr. 1500.

Dumont, Francis. — Les Petits romantiques français. *Paris:* Cahiers du Sud, 1949. 302 pp. Fr. 550.

Durry, Marie-Jeanne. — Flaubert et ses projets inédits. *Paris:* Nizet, 1950. 416 pp. Fr. 600.

Forest, H. U. — L'Esthétique du roman balzacien. *Paris:* Presses univ., 1950. 252 pp. Fr. 400.

Girard, Marcel. — Guide illustré de la litt. fr. moderne, de 1918 à 1949. *Paris:* Seghers, 1949. ii + 259 pp. Fr. 630.

Hall, Vernon, Jr. — Life of Julius Caesar Scaliger. *Philadelphia:* American Philosophical Society, 1950. 86 pp. (*Transactions, XL*, Part 2.).

Hugo, V. — Choix de poésies lyriques. Odes et ballades et Orientales. 2 vols. éd. par Jean Bogaert. *Paris:* Larousse, 1949. 124 et 116 pp. Chaque volume, Fr. 34.

— Préface de "Cromwell" suivie d'extraits d'autres préfaces dramatiques, éd. Pierre Grosclaude. *Paris:* Larousse, 1949. 92 pp. Fr. 34.

— Ruy Blas, éd. Pierre Richard. *Paris:* Larousse, 1949. 167 pp. Fr. 34.

Jacob, Max. — Choix de lettres de M. J. à Jean Cocteau, 1919-44. Préface par Jean Cocteau. *Paris:* Morihiens, 1949. 161 pp. Fr. 270.

Lecomte, Jean. — Expliquez-moi Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *Paris:* Foucher, 1949. Fr. 150.

Lederer, L. (éd.). — Joseph de Maistre. *Paris:* Berger-Levrault, 1949. lxiv + 119 pp. Fr. 270.

Lefebvre, Henri. — Diderot. *Paris:* Hier et aujourd'hui, 1949. 311 pp. Fr. 250.

Lefort, Edmond. — La Touraine de René Boylesvne. *Tours:* Arrault, 1949. 253 pp. Fr. 950.

Li Gotti, Ettore. — La Chanson de Roland e i Normanni. *Florence:* Sansoni, 1949. 89 pp. L. 400.

Liprandi, Claude. — Stendhal, le Bord de l'Eau et la "Note secrète." *Avignon:* Aubanel, 1949. 223 pp.

Lugli, Vittorio (ed.). — Da Villon à Valéry. *Messina:* G. D'Anna, 1949. 427 pp. L. 1600.

Lupin, José. — Expliquez-moi les chansons de geste. *Paris:* Foucher, 1948. 86 pp. Fr. 75.

Mauriac, Fr. — Le Romancier et ses personnages, précédé d'une étude d'Edmond Jaloux. *Paris:* Compagnons du livre, 1949. 217 pp. Fr. 250.

Montesquieu. — *Lettres persanes*, suivies du *Temple de Guide*, éd. Jean Varloot. *Paris:* Bordas, 1949. xx + 299 pp. Fr. 450.

Mornet, Daniel.—Rousseau, L'homme et l'œuvre. *Paris*: Boivin, 1950. vii + 187 pp.

Palfrey, T. R.—*Le Panorama littéraire de l'Europe* (1833-34), une revue légitimiste sous la monarchie de juillet. *Evanston*: Northwestern U. Press, 1950. vi + 154 pp.

Pascal.—Short Life of Christ, tr. and ed. E. Cailliet and J. C. Blankenagel. *Princeton*: Theological Seminary, 1950. 39 pp.

Roach, Wm. and R. H. Ivy, Jr.—The Continuations of the Old French *Perceval* of Chrétien de Troyes. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa., 1950. xvi + 615 pp.

Scherer, Jacques.—La Dramaturgie classique en France. *Paris*: Nizet, 1950. 488 pp. Fr. 950.

Southwell, K. A.—Signposts in French Literature. London [and N. Y.]: Oxford U. Press, 1950. 136 pp. \$1.25.

Wartburg, Walther von.—Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume. *Bern*: Francke, 1950. x + 158 pp. 18 maps. SFr. 13.80.

ITALIAN

Addis, Filippo.—Il Canzoniere di Pietro Mazzia. *Sassari*: Gallizzi, 1950. 15 pp.

Alzator, Francesco.—La letteratura in Sardegna dalle origini al periodo bizantino. *Cagliari*: Tip. Centrale, 1950. 14 pp.

Batani, Maria.—La lirica di Francesco Petrarca. *Bologna*: Casciano, 1950. 124 pp. L. 300.

Benini, Aliento.—Il tramonto di Dante nella città del silenzio. *Ravenna*: Arti grafiche, 1949. 83 pp.

Boccaccio.—Il Decameron, ed. G. Petronio. 2 v. *Turin*: Einaudi, 1950. xiii + 542 + xiii + 423 pp. L. 4500.

Boschi, Egidio.—Giacomo Leopardi. *Alba*: Ed. Paoline, 1948. 299 pp.

Casciola, Brizio.—L'enigma dantesco. *Bergamo*: Arti grafiche, 1950. 381 pp. L. 900.

Cavazzuti, Giuseppe.—Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672-1750). *Modena*: Tip. Modenesi, 1950. 119 pp. L. 300.

Chiari, Alberto e Italiano Marchetti.—L'autore della "Nenia da Barberino." *Milan*: Marzorati, 1948. 143 pp.

Cozzani, Ettore.—Foscolo. Il poeta civili dei "Sepolcri." *Milan*: Ed. L'eroica, 1950. 141 pp.

D'Annunzio, Mario.—Con mio padre sulla nave del ricordo. *Milan*: Mondadori, 1950. 222 pp. L. 800.

Devoto, Giacomo.—Studi di stilistica.

Florence: Le Monnier, 1950. 252 pp. L. 900.

Lanza De Laurentiis, M. T.—Vittorio Alfieri. *Bologna*: Casciano, 1950. 97 pp. L. 250.

Levi, G. A.—Vittorio Alfieri. *Brescia*: Ed. Morelliana, 1950. 291 pp. L. 650.

Marzot, Giulio.—Un classico della controriforma: Paolo Segneri. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1950. 247 pp. L. 900.

Montanari, Francesco.—Giosuè Carducci intimo. *Florence*: Barbèra, 1950. 185 pp. L. 700.

Monticone, Severino.—Giulio Salvadori il poeta dell'umile Italia. *Alba*: Ed. Paoline, 1948. 259 pp.

Muscarà, Corrado.—Il dolore nei "Promessi Sposi." *Rome*: Bardi, 1950. 207 pp. L. 800.

Pancrazi, Pietro.—Scrittori d'oggi. Segni del tempo. Serie V. *Bari*: Laterza, 1950. viii + 250 pp. L. 700.

Rutigliano, Maria.—Sulle "Grazie" del Foscolo. *Bari*: Liantonio, 1950. 109 pp.

Scotti, R. M.—Carducci tra classicismo e romanticismo. *Bari*: Resta, 1950. ix + 101 pp. L. 450.

Vailati, Maria.—Il tormento artistico del Tasso dalla "Liberata" alla "Conquistata." *Milan*: Marzorati, 1950. 79 pp.

Vannucci, Pasquale.—Pascoli e gli Scolopi. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1950. vii + 395 pp. L. 1000.

Weiss, Roberto.—Un inedito petrarchesco. La redazione sconosciuta di un capitolo del "Trionfo della fama." *Rome*: Ed. di Storia e lett., 1950. 87 pp.

SPANISH

Aguirre, Adolfo de.—Selección y estudio de Fr. de Nardiz. *Santander*: Libr. Moderna, 1950. lxii + 116 pp.

Alegria, Claribel.—Anillo de silencio. Pról. de José Vasconcelos. *Mexico*: Botas, 1948. 90 pp.

Alonso, Dámaso.—Hijos de la ira. *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1946. 167 pp.

Arrieta, R. A.—La literatura argentina y sus vínculos con España. *Buenos Aires*: Inst. Cultural Española, 1948. 166 pp.

Barrera, Isaac J.—La literatura del Ecuador. *Buenos Aires*: Filosofía y Letras, 1948. 170 pp.

Bassagoda, R. D.—Composiciones olvidadas de José Mármol. *Montevideo*: Ed. del autor, 1948.

Carilla, E.—El gongorismo en América. *Buenos Aires*: Coni, 1946.

— La sátira de Lavardén. *Catamarca*, Arg.: El Ambato, 1946. 28 pp.

Cervantes.—Novelas ejemplares, ed. J. L. Borges. *Buenos Aires*: Emecé, 1946. 659 pp.

— La sabiduría, ed. A. J. Vaccaro, *Buenos Aires*: A. Zamora, 1947.

Corona Baratech, C. E.—Toponimia navarra en la Edad Media. *Huesca*: C. S. I. C., 1947. ix + 145 pp.

Cortázar, A. R.—Echeverría: Iniciador de un rumbo hacia lo nuestro. *Buenos Aires*: Peuser, 1946. 30 pp.

Fernandez Llera, Victor.—Selección y estudio de Javier Cruzado. *Santander*: Libr. Moderna, 1950. xci + 77 pp.

Floridano Cumbreño, A. C.—Curso general de paleografía y diplomática españolas. 2 v. *Oviedo*: Pubs. de la Universidad, 1946.

González Martínez, E.—Preludios, Lirismos, etc., ed. A. Castro Leal. *Méjico*: Porrúa, 1946. xiv + 302 pp.

Guarner, Luis (ed.).—El Amor en la Poesía. Antigüedad clásica. Renacimiento. 2 v. *Madrid*: Afr. Aguado, 1950. 150 + 182 pp.

Jameson, S. B.—English Translations of Latin American Literature. A Bibliog. *Washington*: Pan Am. Union, 1947. 17 pp.

León Felipe.—Antología rota, 1920-47. Epílogo de G. de Torre. *Buenos Aires*: Pleamar, 1947. 265 pp.

Meza de Padilla, R.—Antología de poetas costarricenses. *San José, C. R.*: La Tribuna, 1946. 276 pp.

Molina, Juan Ramón.—Tierras, mares y cielos. Pról. de A. Díaz Lozano, Bibliog. de R. H. Valle. *Guatemala*: Eds. del Gobierno, 1947. 235 pp.

Mujica Láinez, M.—Vida de Anastasio el Pollo. *Buenos Aires*: Emecé, 1948.

Ramos Calles, R.—Los personajes de Rómulo Gallegos a través del psicoanálisis. *Caracas*: Edit. Grafolit, 1947.

Sanchez, R. G.—García Lorca. Estudio sobre su teatro. *Madrid*: Sánchez Cuesta, 1950. 166 pp.

Tomé, E.—Jorge Manrique. *Montevideo*: Mosca, 1946.

Tordesillas, J.—Cervantes. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Santa Catalina, 1947.

Valera, Juan.—Cartas desde Rusia. 2 v. *Madrid*: Afr. Aguado, 1950. 196 + 162 pp.

Vallejo Nágera, Antonio.—Literatura y

Psiquiatría. *Barcelona*: Barna, 1950. xiv + 189 pp.

Vásquez, J.—Recopilación de sonetos y villancicos a quatro y a cinco. *Barcelona*: C. S. I. C., 1946. viii + 227 pp.

Wiesse, María.—Antología de la poesía amorosa peruana. *Lima*: Hora del Hombre, 1946. 16 pp.

Xanamar, L. F.—La poesía de Juana del Valle Caviedes en el Perú colonial. *Lima*: Miranda, 1946. 16 pp.

PORtUGUESE

Albuquerque, A. Tenório d'.—Falsos brasileirismos. *Rio de Janeiro*: Getúlio Costa, 1947.

Bettencourt, G. de.—A Amazônia no fabulário e na arte. *Lisbon*: Pro Domo, 1946. 175 pp.

Capela e Silva, J. A.—A linguagem rustica no Concelho de Elvas. *Lisbon*: Império, 1947. 207 pp.

Carneiro, E.—Trajetória de Castro Alves. *Rio de Janeiro*: Vitoria, 1947. 158 pp.

Bandeira, Manuel.—Antología de poetas brasileiros bissextos contemporâneos. *Rio de Janeiro*: Zelio Valverde, 1946. 212 pp.

Coutinho, B. X.—Camões e as artes plásticas. *Oporto*: Figueirinhas, 1946. xxiv + 466 pp.

Fernandes, I. X.—Questões de língua pátria. V. II. *Lisbon*: Império, 1947. 253 pp.

Freitas, J. B. de.—Forma e expressão no romance brasileiro. *Rio de Janeiro*: Ponte, 1947. 364 pp.

Pires de Lima, J. A.—O corpo humano no adágio português. *Oporto*: Altura, 1946. 173 pp.

Sousa, J. de Campos e.—Processo genealógico de Camilo Castelo Branco. *Lisbon*: Gama, 1947. xv + 232 pp.

ROUMANIAN

Popinceanu, Ion.—Rumänische Elementargrammatik. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1950. 132 pp. RM. 5.50.

POLISH

Grappin, Henri.—Grammaire de la langue polonoise. *Paris*: Institut d'études slaves, 1949. 330 pp. Fr. 500.

*Four invaluable aids for
English teachers and their students*

WRITING YOUR POEM

By Lawrence J. Zillman

Associate Professor of English, University of Washington

A practical and stimulating approach to verse writing, this book offers a clear explanation of the elements of strength and weakness in the tools the poet uses and in the way he uses them. Broad in scope, up-to-date in approach, it will be invaluable to anyone interested in writing poetry of consistently high quality—and to everyone who wishes a deeper, fuller understanding of the art of poetry in general.

\$2.75

FUNK & WAGNALLS

NEW COLLEGE STANDARD DICTIONARY

Emphatype Edition

145,000 Funk & Wagnalls-tested definitions—thousands more than any other dictionary in its field—are more complete, dependable. Features Emphatype, the simplest, surest way of showing you how to pronounce a word, synonyms, antonyms, etymologies, biographical data. 1420 pages. 100 illustrations.

\$5.50 plain, \$6.00 with thumb index.

STANDARD HANDBOOK OF SYNONYMS ANTONYMS AND PREPOSITIONS

This new, completely revised edition of this great reference book—for years a standard for teachers, students, speakers, authors—has been reset in new, easy-to-read typographical form. 8,000 synonyms and 4,000 antonyms, together with the correct use of prepositions. Double index.

\$3.00

WRITE THAT PLAY

By Kenneth Thorpe Rowe

Professor of Playwriting, University of Michigan

A concentrated handbook of playwriting which will lead the aspiring dramatist step-by-step through the various problems confronting him, from the finding and organizing of dramatic material to the production of his completed play. Covers the one-act play and the longer play, dramatic technique and theory, and what to do with a play after it is written. 418 pages.

\$3.00

Send for examination copies on approval.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, 153 East 24th Street, New York 10

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS

Used as text in leading universities

THE ALPHABET

by DAVID DIRINGER, D. Litt.

One of the most important works of real scholarship published in this century. "It is bound to stand as the most authoritative treatment of the history of alphabetical writing for a long time to come. Extraordinarily scholarly and exhaustive, it is, incidentally, also quite exciting reading. The many illustrations add much to the fascination of the book."—*Scientific Monthly*.

The main text is divided into two parts: Non-Alphabetic Systems of Writing and Alphabetical Scripts.

1,000 illustrations, 600 pages \$12.00

DICTIONARY OF WORD UNUSUAL WORDS AND ORIGINS HOW THEY CAME ABOUT

by Joseph T. Shipley

The stories of the words we use—where they began, and how they grew across centuries and countries—from ancient Sanskrit right through World War II—told with authority in a lively style. A first-class reference work.

"Great fun as well as a liberal education."—Burton Roscoe

\$5.00

by Edwin Radford

"A collection of proverbial 'tags,' phrases and words, together with their origins or derivations. Full of rare information for word lovers."—*Bulletin of New York City Association of Teachers of English* \$3.75

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

15 East 40th Street, Desk 138, New York 16, N. Y.

*Expedite Shipment by Prepayment
Special student bulk rate on 10 or more*

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS

DICTIONARY OF FOREIGN WORDS AND PHRASES

by Maxim Newmark, Ph. D.

Foreign terms form a large part of our contemporary English vocabulary, and every literate person must at least recognize them if he wishes to be attuned to the subtler overtones of expression. It is the special function of this dictionary to provide English equivalents or definitions of the most frequent foreign terms that are constantly pouring into the all-embracing stream of English. \$6.00

The HEBREW IMPACT ON WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Edited by Dagobert D. Runes

This epochal symposium is a sociological and historical contribution of utmost importance. Each of the 17 authors is an authority in his field. Subjects covered include the Jew's effect on: religion, the arts and sciences, law, philosophy, the democratic idea. Frankly discussed are the Jew as statesman, as soldier, in public life, in social work; in drama, theatre, film and the dance; music, painting and sculpture.

"An eye-opener to the majority of even well-informed people."

—Henry Pratt Fairchild, *New York University*.

900 Pages . . . \$10

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

Publishers

15 E. 40 St. Desk 138, N. Y. 16

Special bulk rate on 10 or more

Expedite shipment by prepayment

TO BE PUBLISHED IN JULY, 1951:

A SHORT HISTORY OF ITALIAN LITERATURE

BY ROBERT A. HALL, JR.

Professor of Linguistics, Cornell University

This work gives an account of the development of Italian literature from the earliest times to the present day. Written from the point of view of the American student, it includes full but concise discussion of individual authors and their works, and also of general trends, with especial attention to social and cultural backgrounds. Instead of following the traditional division of literary history into centuries, the arrangement of the book reflects the periods inherent in the development of Italian literature and culture itself. The work is divided into six main parts, with a total of twenty chapters.

Hall's *Short History of Italian Literature* will be of interest to all teachers and students of Italian, and will be valuable also to workers in other national literatures and in comparative literature. It is especially suited for use as a textbook in courses in the history of Italian literature, and as a reference work for courses in general literature.

Approximately 400 pp., in paper covers; \$4.00. Special pre-publication price, \$3.00 (post-free if prepaid). Order from:

LINGUISTICA

BOX 619, ITHACA, N. Y.

PHILOLOGICA: *The Malone Anniversary Studies*

Edited by THOMAS A. KIRBY and HENRY B. WOOLF

395 pages

6 x 9

\$7.50

PHILOLOGICA: *The Malone Anniversary Studies* presents 43 new and original articles by American and foreign scholars who have collaborated in the preparation of a volume of studies honoring Kemp Malone on his sixtieth birthday and the twenty-fifth anniversary of his joining the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University. The contents embrace studies in medieval literature and language, the two fields to which Professor Malone has contributed so significantly.

The following articles, together with a preface and a bibliography of the writings of Kemp Malone, comprise the volume—a source of both pleasure and stimulation to all whose interests lie in the field of medieval literature and language.

THE CONTRIBUTORS AND THEIR ARTICLES

- Archer Taylor**
The Varieties of Riddles
- Erika von Erhardt-Siebold**
The Old English Loom Riddles
- Norman E. Eliason**
Riddle 68 of the *Exeter Book*
- Francis P. Magoun, Jr.**
Danes, North, South, East, and West, in *Beowulf*
- Simeon Potter**
King Alfred's Last Preface
- Else von Schaubert**
Zur Erklärung Schwierigkeiten bietender alt-englischer Textstellen
- George W. Cobb**
The Subjunctive Mood in Old English Poetry
- Robert J. Menner**
The Anglican Vocabulary of the *Blickling Homilies*
- Rudolph Willard**
The *Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily* and Cæsarius of Arles
- Albert H. Marckwardt**
Verb Inflection in Late Old English
- Barlett Jere Whiting**
The Rhyme of King William
- Dorothy Bethurum**
A Letter of Protest from the English Bishops to the Pope
- H. Lüdecke**
The London Basin in the Saxon Invasion
- Tom Peete Cross**
Celtic Mythology and Arthurian Romance
- Howard R. Patch**
The Adaptation of Otherworld Motifs to Medieval Romance
- Howard Meroney**
Full Name and Address in Early Irish
- Laura Hibbard Loomis**
The Saint Mercurius Legend in Medieval England and in Norse Saga
- Eilert Ekwall**
Two Middle English Etymologies
- C. T. Onions**
Comments and Speculations on the Text of *Havelok*
- Henning Larsen**
Cursor Mundi 1291
- Henry L. Savage**
The Green Knight's *Molaynes*
- Marie Padgett Hamilton**
The Convent of Chaucer's Prioress and Her Priests
- Rodger Sherman Loomis**
A Parallel to the Franklin's Discussion of Marriage
- D. D. Griffith**
On Word-Studies in Chaucer
- Albert C. Baugh**
A Fraternity of Drinkers
- Walther P. Fischer**
King Lear at Tuebingen: Johannes Naclerus and Geoffrey of Monmouth
- Stith Thompson**
Story-Writers and Story-Tellers
- Samuel A. Small**
The *Iuventus* Stage of Life
- Helge Kökeritz**
John Hart and Early Standard English
- Philip H. Goepf, II**
Verstegan's "Most Ancient Saxon Words"
- Thomas A. Kirby**
Jefferson's Letters to Pickering
- Franklin D. Cooley**
Contemporary Reaction to the Identification of Hygelac
- David J. Savage**
Grundtvig: a Stimulus to Old English Scholarship
- Henry Bosley Woolf**
Longfellow's Interest in Old English
- Thomas Pyles**
That Fine Italian *A* in American English
- R. W. Zandvoort**
On Two Collective Functions of the Nominal S-Suffix
- Allen Walker Read**
English Words with Constituent Elements Having Independent Semantic Value
- H. L. Mencken**
The Birth of New Verbs
- Eston E. Ericson**
New Meanings in Current English
- Gudmund Schütte**
Gothonic: the Most Neutral Denomination for the Germanic Nations
- William A. Read**
Various Words from the Antilles and South America
- Stefán Einarsson**
Icelandic Popular Poetry of the Middle Ages
- Björn Guðfinnsson**
An Icelandic Dialect Feature: the Pronunciation of *Hv-* and *Kv-*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS — BALTIMORE 18, MD.

s
0
y
es
g
-
P
ts
of
is
t
-
al
g
or
h
n





Three Icelandic Sagas

Translated by MARGARET SCHLAUCH and M. H. SCARGILL. Here are three sagas of the rugged seafaring people of Iceland in the late 10th and early 11th centuries. The rivalry of two warrior-poets for the fair Helga in the *Saga of Gunnlaug and Hrafn*. A lawsuit of eight leaders against Odd, Ofeig's son in the *Saga of Eight Confederates*. And the intensity of a family feud in the *Saga of Droplaug's Sons*. Miss Schlauch, Professor of English at New York University, and Mr. Scargill, who is at the University of Alberta, Canada, have translated these sagas in a current and natural idiom. Published for the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

\$3.00

Seven One-Act Plays by Holberg

Translated by HENRY ALEXANDER. These short plays by Ludwig Holberg, the great Danish-Norwegian playwright, reveal in brilliant and sparkling miniature his genius for social comedy. He pricks the vanity of snobbery, mocks the worship of riches, deals with the world of philosophers and has fun with the theme of common sense. Mr. Alexander, also the translator of *Four Plays by Holberg*, is at Queen's University, Canada. Published for the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

\$3.50

At your bookstore, PRINCETON University Press

a compact presentation of all phases of French culture . . .

DENOEU'S
P
ETIT MIROIR
de la Civilisation Française, REVISED

Revised to include the dramatic decade 1938-1948 and to bring all the other material up to date, *Petit Miroir* continues to be the standard source of information on France and the French people for intermediate and advanced classes. 350 pages text. Fully illustrated.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

GENERAL PHONETICS

By Roe-Merrill S. Heffner. A detailed explanation of the physiology of speech and the physics of speech sounds. The principal types of speech sound are described with their variations and their occurrence both as individual phenomena and as speech sounds in context. For the scientific linguist and the practical teacher of speech, with the emphasis on observed fact rather than on theory.

W. F. Twaddell in the Foreword: "A picture of the state of phonetic knowledge today, valuable and interesting as much for its indication of the sources and methods and aims of phonetic study as for its descriptions and explanations."

300 pages, 25 drawings and diagrams, index. \$7.50

STUDIES IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY POETIC

By Ruth Wallerstein. Douglas Bush: "I have no doubt about the book's importance. By concentrating on [the funeral elegy] and treating it against a large philosophical and literary background, the author greatly enlarges the significance of her subject. Also her critical insight, in her prolonged analyses of particular poems and of Marvell, is precise, fresh, and altogether rewarding."

420 pages, illustrated, index. \$6.50

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

811 STATE STREET

MADISON, WIS.